DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 038 SO 019 243

AUTHOR	Rutkowski, Edward, Ed.
TITLE	Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society (8th, Chicago, Illinois, October 24-27, 1973).
INSTITUTION	Midwest History of Education Society, Cedar Falls, IA.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	103p.; For related documents, see SO 019 242-257.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society; v2 1974
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges; *Educational Administration; *Educational History; *Educational Legislation; Educational Philosophy; Educational Research; Higher Education; Identification (Psychology); Social Environment; State Boards of Education; Values Education; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS	Anarchism; *Japan; Neill (A S); Nineteenth Century; Office of Education; Twentieth Century

ABSTRACT

These papers from the Midwest History of Education Society's 1973 annual meeting include topics on United States and Japanese education, A. S. Neill, and Ella Flagg Young. The editor's supplement includes two papers on U.S. educational administration. "American Education at the Turn of the Century" (P. A. Graham) urges that research of this period focus less on educational reforms and examine the educational process instead. "The History of the Soka Gakkai Movement and Its Educational Implications" (C. H. Gross) describes the history, the appeal, and the philosophical base of the Soka Gakkai (Value Creation Society) in Japan from 1930 to the present. "A. S. Neill, Summerhill, and the Anarchist Tradition" (J. Kirschner) examines anarchism and traces its influence on Neill's educational philosophy. "National Identity and Education: Symbols and Reality" (N. R. Bernier) is a thought paper on national cohesion through the socialization process. To avoid national disintegration, a national identity is promoted through national symbols that incorporate a collective self-image of an interdependent people. "Ella Flagg Young: Chicago School Superintendent, 1909-1915" (R. V. Donatelli) details the accomplishments of Young. "The Founding of the U.S. Office of Education: A Legislative History" (D. R. Warren) describes the U.S. Congress's debates over H.R. 276 in 1866-67 for the formation of the U.S. Office of Education. "The Iowa Experiment with an Integrated System of Higher Education" (E. Rutkowski) describes the history of the attempted coordination of Iowa's three state universities and their curricula under a state board of control at the turn of the century. The program, the business meeting's minutes, and attendees' list is included. (DJC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED298038

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1973 ANNUAL MEETING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
EDWARD RUTKOWSKI
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SO 019243

College of Education
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1973 ANNUAL MEETING

College of Education
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Distributed and Published for the Society by the

College of Education

University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copyright 1974 by the Midwest History

of Education Society

Edited by

Edward Rutkowski, University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Any subscription or inquiries should be sent to the
Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society
Education Center, Room 513
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

EDITOR'S FORWARD

This is the second edition of our journal. We were honored this year to be able to host the national History of Education Society Conference in conjunction with our annual Midwest History of Education Society Meeting at the downtown campus of Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois. This joint meeting, the first in the history of both societies was a rewarding experience for us all. The papers printed in this edition are from the Midwest History of Education Society portion of the program and are fine examples of the scholarly work of the society. It is hoped that in the future we will be able to publish more of the papers which were presented in the national History of Education section of the meeting.

The reader will notice a change in the format of our journal. A new typeface was selected for readability and the publication was slightly altered for economy and ease of binding. The journal in terms of scholarly papers is substantially the same as our first edition.

We are indeed delighted to be able to include in this edition the address of Dr. Patricia A. Graham entitled American Education at the Turn of the Century, which was presented at the presidential banquet. It was significant that Dr. Graham, a past president of the national society, had as the focus of her paper the importance of the Midwest in the historical development of American Education. As we all know, this was the main purpose in the founding of our society.

The Editor's Supplement is composed of two papers on the theme of American Educational Administration. The first paper by Donald R. Warren, The Founding of the U. S. Office of Education was presented at the first meeting of our society in 1966 and drew a great deal of praise. It will be published as part of a new book, To Enforce Education: A History of the Founding Years of the U. S. Office of Education, Wayne State University Press. The other paper, by the editor, was originally presented at the 1968 meeting by him and it deals with the establishment of the Iowa State Board of Regents.

The contents of this edition will speak for themselves. A short appraisal of the table of contents will indicate the academic breath, scholarly quality, and comprehensive scope of our endeavors. Again as in the past, our deepest and most sincere thanks must go to our friends and colleagues at Loyola University. Also, the editor would like to thank his own institution, the University of Northern Iowa and specifically the staff of the College of Education for their generous help and understanding in publishing the journal. It can only make one feel very proud to be a part of such a satisfying educational experience.

Edward Rutkowski, Editor

CONTENTS

PART I

PAPERS

AMERICAN EDUCATION AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY
by Patricia Albjerg Graham 1

HISTORY OF THE SOKAGAKKIA MOVEMENT AND ITS EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS
by Carl H. Gross 10

A. S. NEILL, SUMMERHILL AND ANARCHIST TRADITION
by Joseph Kirschner 22

NATIONAL IDENTITY AND EDUCATION: SYMBOLS AND REALITY
by Normand R. Bernier 36

ELLA FLAGG YOUNG: CHICAGO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT 1909-1915
by Rosemary Donatelli 48

THE EDITOR'S SUPPLEMENT
THE FOUNDING OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION A LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
by Donald R. Warren 58

THE IOWA EXPERIMENT WITH AN INTEGRATED SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
by Edward Rutkowski 73

PART II

THE OFFICIAL PROGRAM OF THE 1973 ANNUAL MEETING 88

THE BUSINESS MEETING AND ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY 93

DIRECTORY OF ATTENDANCE OF THE 1973 MEETING . . 94

American Education at the Turn of the Century

Patricia Albjerg Graham
Professor of Education
Barnard College
Columbia University

The history of American education as a field of study was born in the Midwest. Three of the earliest historians of education were Midwesterners, and their experiences in this part of the nation deeply affected their work. Edward Eggleston, best known for his fictional portrayal of education in The Hoosier School-Master (1871) and for his effort to achieve a broader historical perspective in The Transit of Civilization (1900), was born and grew up in southern Indiana, where he later taught school, before he moved to Minnesota as a Methodist preacher. Although he ventured east to Brooklyn, he returned to the Midwest, to Chicago, the archetypical American city at the turn of the century.

Two other early historians of American education: Paul Monroe, who established the history of education as a field of study at Teachers College, Columbia University at the turn of the century, and his best known student, Ellwood Patterson Cubberley, who probably is one of the few historians of education ever to make money at the craft, were both born and reared in Indiana in the post-Civil War period. Their writings about the history of American education, which have been much maligned by more recent critics, were considerably determined by their youthful midwestern experiences. The America they described was one they knew, one that was intensely midwestern, and one that may seem unfamiliar to later generations more accustomed to other localities.

In thinking, talking, and writing about American education at the turn of the century, I have come to believe that three considerations are particularly important. First, I would suggest that we concentrate our investigations in education upon the status quo, not upon the reform movements nor upon the novel educational ideas being proposed by well-intentioned laymen and educators. Secondly, I would suggest that if we are to have a comprehensive picture of American education at the turn of the century, we must look at the nation regionally. We must turn our attention to the integers that made up that sum of America, rather than attempting to look merely at the sum itself. Just as Monroe and Cubberley saw American education radiating from a Hoosier core, so must not we perceive it emanating from Massachusetts, New York or even Chicago. In short, we must pay particular attention to the regional differences that characterized the nation at that time and which also affected educational developments in important ways. Finally, we need to recognize this as a time in American life of institution-building, and the essential educational institution was the school. Again, older historians of education have been castigated for their exclusive concern with the schools, but for late nineteenth and early twentieth century America, the schools played a role of monumental importance, perhaps of greater educational significance relative to other educational activities than at any other time before or since.

For those of us who are historians of education, the educational reforms or the new educational ideas are the concerns which often intrigue us most in studying the history of education. Novelty has invariably attracted greater attention than conventional behavior. Therefore, in the late nineteenth century we are much more inclined to look for the roots of subsequent educational change than we are to describe the educational activities in which the largest proportion of the population was engaged. The progressive education movement, for example, has had numerous chroniclers (of whom I have been one), and most of us have looked to the nineteenth century for the origins of this important educational movement. Our interest in the late nineteenth century has focused upon those activities which were preludes to or exemplars of later practices.

Enough attention has been given to this search for roots. But in this quest for roots of a reform we are perilously close to a version of Whig history, seeking explanations for subsequent events while minimizing or ignoring the events that were of importance at that particular time. Our attention turns to the speech here or the article there that presages the future.

The roots of the progressive education movement are indeed buried in the soil of the late nineteenth century, and I am not suggesting that it is unworthy to attempt to locate them. Rather, I am urging that fewer of us spend our time so engaged in the exploration of the sub-terranean. It would seem to me that many of us might well give our attention to what was flowering in the later nineteenth century. We might concentrate our attentions upon what educational experiences persons in turn of the century America might be expected to have; in short, what in fact was then happening in education in America. If we were to do this, I think that we might well shift our terminology about "educational eras" in America. Rather than calling the pre-Civil War period "the age of the common school" the post-Civil War period might instead be termed that. The 1840's and 50's were the time of the reformers, Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and others, who sought to institutionalize publicly-supported schools in New England and elsewhere. They were largely successful in Massachusetts and Connecticut in those years in achieving those reforms and in some eastern towns and cities as well. These innovations did not become widespread through the nation, however, until after the Civil War.

Doing this kind of history, however, has its difficulties. Many of us who are historians are fearful of being merely antiquarians. We are all too aware of the pitfalls of research that emphasize particular educational practices of a given school or community at a particular time. This kind of activity smacks too much of a garroulous elderly aunt reminiscing about the good old days – a kind of history that we have all been taught to avoid. We prefer the historical evidence that comes already written down; that gives it a seeming authenticity which we prefer. Particularly we like it if the person who wrote it down is someone whom we already know about; that is the advantage of "root" research. We know who will be important, and we can look to their early papers. For those who never become important, however, we have no such easy guidelines. We are faced with much more serious problems of assessment of what should legitimately be considered important. We must make difficult decisions as to how significant we should consider the diary of a young girl describing her schooling, which some fond descendent has preserved in her attic. Was this TYPICAL, we ask? Searching for what was statistically typical, we can become enmired in such difficulties that we will thankfully return to the "root" research, for at least then we know that if it was not typical, at least it was eventually important. Fortunately more historians of education (and other kinds of historians as well) are turning toward this research on the status quo, eschewing the easy category of what was subsequently important, and turning instead to the considerably more complicated task of evaluating contemporary educational experiences.

Closely related to the need to do history of education as history of the status quo rather than as history of educational reform, is the need to look at turn of the century America from a regional, rather than a national, perspective. Too often in the history of education in the United States we have spoken of educational developments in the nation as a whole, made allowance for the exceptionality of the South, and let regional differences be damned.

The problems with this approach can be quickly seen by looking at the 1910 census figures for the proportion of the children aged six to fourteen attending school. There we find that the national figure was 81 percent. But when we examine them more closely we find that the distribution was in fact bi-modal. In the three southern regions, 70 percent were in school; while in New England, the Middle Atlantic and north Central states, nearly ninety percent were in school. Only in the West, which then accounted for just over ten percent of the children in the country, were the proportions of children in school near the national average.

Our monographic research has fostered this tendency toward nationally-oriented research, and it is easy to understand why. Who in his or her right mind would choose to spend the summer in an un-air-conditioned library of a local historical society in southern Illinois when they might alternatively spend it in the much pleasanter surroundings of the Massachusetts Historical Society or Weider Library at Harvard, both within easy weekend reach of Cape Cod? Even New York, which its promoters call "a summer festival," may seem more appealing (at least some of its libraries are air-conditioned!) than the state archives collection in Montgomery, Alabama. Further, historians of education will tend to meet more of their number in Boston, New York, Chicago, Madison or Berkeley than they will in Vandalia or

Montgomery. Most of us teaching at colleges or universities feel ourselves isolated. If we are lucky, we will have two or three colleagues who may also be interested in the history of education, but most of us work essentially alone. No wonder that we seek places to do research where we will encounter others who may also be interested in the history of education.

The difficulty, however, is that most of these pleasant libraries have substantial collections that reflect their locations. They will carry full reports on the city's emerging school system plus the city's newspapers. But they will have much more limited collections of the rural areas and small towns in which the majority of Americans lived until 1920. Consequently, we are beginning to have a number of fine studies of urban areas and of their educational opportunities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (I think particularly of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and St. Louis as well as shorter studies of other communities, such as Portland, Oregon), but we have very few comparable ones of rural areas and small towns. Urban areas are now the most important areas of the nation, in terms of the percentage of the population living in them, but in 1900 the majority of the populace was not urban. One can argue, of course, that cities have set the standard for the nation, that what went on in the cities has been widely emulated throughout the rest of the country, and I think that I would agree with that. Nonetheless, such concentration upon the cities is comparable to the progressive education "root" research. If we want to know what was happening educationally to the American people in 1900, we need to give considerably more attention than we have previously to local studies, studies of rural areas and small towns.

Local history in this country has been situated under nearly as dark a cloud as history of education. Who wishes to encounter fellow researchers in a local historical society whose principal interests are geneological? Nonetheless, from sociologists, anthropologists, and even from European social historians, we have much to learn about good local history. Some of us who are particularly interested in applying social science techniques to historical questions are making great strides in community studies. The work now being done in Hamilton, Ontario especially comes to mind. The impressionistic Wisconsin Death Trip is another example of an altogether different type of local history.

For those of us either who do not yet have advanced social science techniques at our fingertips or who cannot work in part of a larger project, local history of education seems particularly appropriate. I know no historians of education who are satisfied with their local library's collection as being fully adequate for their research. Obviously when you live in Marquette and do research on Philadelphia, the problem is especially difficult, but these library inadequacies are minimized when you do local research. Only in Marquette can you read the Mining Journal; when you work on it, you are indeed doing primary research. You need not be concerned that you will be scooped by someone else's article on its editorial policy, a danger in doing comparable work on the New York Tribune.

The final observation I would like to make on the history of American education at the turn of the century concerns the preeminence of the schools at that time. If one were to ask the proverbial intelligent layman to characterize "an educated man" in America in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, the answer undoubtedly would be given in terms of his knowledge of the classics, his familiarity with various standard works and ideas. By the early years of the twentieth century, such a question would have produced, I believe, a different reply. Rather, the first response would have been "a man who had gone to college." An important transition occurred in America around the turn of the century when where one had studied, rather than what one knew, became the standard of education. I would argue that the last years of the nineteenth and the early years of the twentieth century were the crucial ones encompassing this change. At no other time in our history, I believe, have the schools been so important. At this time they were assuming extraordinary burdens formerly assigned to other social agencies, and they were as well having to deal with an immensely greater body of knowledge. Perhaps most important of all, it was rapidly becoming essential that they be successful with each student. Unlike former times when their success rate could be thirty or forty percent in terms of children achieving an eighth grade equivalency, by the early twentieth century the pressure was on the schools to achieve a higher ratio of academically successful children. Further, the schools generally and society at large were not yet disenchanted about the schools' abilities to solve the extraordinary variety of educational and social problems with which they were presented. In short, for turn of the century America, schools assumed a larger responsibility for the education of the American people than at any time before or since. The fact that Monroe and Cubberley wrote their histories of education at this time may account for their preoccupation with schools.

Whether the schools were public or private or parochial probably made less difference in terms of what the students learned and in terms of the schools' acculturation effect upon their pupils than we have generally held. In an era before widespread public transportation schools served the children who lived near them. Those who lived far away from them, as in rural areas particularly, were of course at a disadvantage. But in towns with more than one school and in cities school attendance was largely determined by residential patterns with the important exception of blacks who were educated in separate schools in the south and in many sections of the north. Residential patterns tended to be moderately homogeneous so that in public schools there was not likely to be a varied socio-economic mix in a city school. If the town were large enough to have several schools, one of these usually served the wealthy section of the town, another the poor section, and so on. The difference between a public school located in the best neighborhood and a private school, which would presumably draw upon the children of well-to-do for its enrollment, probably was not very great. Similarly, the differences between a public school located in an immigrant neighborhood with predominantly Jewish families and a Roman Catholics parochial school attached to an ethnic parish composed primarily of Italian immigrant families, again were not enormous, exception being made for the addition of Christian doctrine in the parochial schools. In all these cases the opportunity to mix with other children of different social and ethnic backgrounds was not great.

Nonetheless, the schools were indeed "Americanizing" the youngsters even though they may not have been mixing with children of different social, economic, and ethnic strata from themselves. Probably the most important aspect of "Americanization" was becoming acquainted with American customs, attitudes, and rhetoric. In those schools where the children were predominantly non-American by descent – perhaps even particularly – in those schools was there an effort made to transmit these attitudes and traditions to the children. From what evidence we have, the children and their parents were eager that the children acquire these stigmata of Americanism. The effect may well have been enhanced by the separation of many immigrant youngsters from mainstream Americans.

The schools, then, were critical at the turn of the century as a means of acquiring literacy, of adopting American ways, and of acquainting oneself with the immense variety of knowledge that no longer could easily be passed on from one generation to another in the home. The states rapidly passed – though less rapidly enforced – compulsory education laws, which reflected the society's recognition of these new responsibilities of the schools. Curiously enough, these laws mandated school attendance, not literacy, or some other demonstrable academic achievement. Historians have given considerable attention to these laws. They have speculated about their relation to child labor laws, to the effort to reduce the size of the work force. It is important, though, for historians of education to recognize that the pressure was for school attendance with the additional benefits besides mere literacy or testable academic achievements that school attendance was supposed to bring.

The expansion of the school curriculum was indeed part of the growing responsibilities that the schools assumed. Nowhere is this clearer than in the vocational programs, some of which had originated as manual training programs simply to give children experience using their hands as well as their heads. By the turn of the century, however, vocational training had become established in a number of localities, usually in communities with a large number of immigrants or black children. In either case vocational education served the multiple purposes of teaching skills formerly learned on the job or through apprenticeships, of providing a more varied curriculum which hopefully would keep students (particularly boys) in the beneficial school atmosphere longer, and less explicitly of streaming children into programs that would not be likely to give them much educational mobility. This final effect has been the object of considerable attention by recent historians of education, and I do not wish to pursue it here other than simply to note that the fact that the school could be used as a streaming device was a relatively new concept in America and one that reflected the new significance of formal education in the United States.

Formalization of learning within the schools had become commonplace by the turn of the century. This trend was certainly noticeable at the college and university levels. In admissions requirements the new demand was for school certification of achievement, rather than demonstration of learning either through examination or through satisfactory completion of the first year of the college courses. Throughout the eighteenth and most of the nineteenth centuries, students had been admitted to college simply if they were warm-blooded, could pay the tuition, and could give the most cursory evidence of some acquaintance with English and possibly Latin. By the turn of the century this had changed. Increasingly applicants to college could no longer demonstrate their ability to do undergraduate work by examination or other illustration of their knowledge. Rather, they must have a high school diploma – a document testifying to their satisfactory attendance and completion of a school program. Again, not what they knew but where they had studied was the determinant.

Further along the academic line the pressure for school attendance grew. Teachers throughout the nineteenth century were usually licensed (if they were licensed at all) on the basis of examination, but the move toward professionalization demanded completion of a set curriculum – a tendency that is only now being challenged by the competency-based teacher certification. In the professions as well, apprenticeship was out, and formal study was in. One could no longer read law in a jurist's office. Rather, one had to attend law school before one could take the bar exam. Throughout American educational life at the turn of the century, formal study within an educational institution was replacing that which previously had been handled informally or individually. The examination was out, and course attendance was in.

No area demonstrates this better, perhaps, than the college and university curricula, especially those of the land grant state universities. For example, to be a farmer in early nineteenth century America one simply hung around a farm, preferably one's family farms and picked up the lore and practice of successful farming from the exemplars in the neighborhood. By the end of the nineteenth century in the leading farm regions state universities were telling the farmers that they should send their sons to the campus for four years to be taught in classrooms and on model farms how to be good farmers. Such a notion seemed ludicrous to many, who believed that the four years would be wasted. The most that many would accept was that a particular "short course," given by the staff of the state agriculture school in the slack winter season, might be of some value to a farmer. But enrollments grew spectacularly in Schools of Agriculture in the Morrill Act universities, a testimony in part to the increased role of formal instruction.

Much the same phenomenon occurred with young women for whom the state universities established departments of home economics in order to train them to become better housewives. Formerly such training was limited to that provided by the home, but by the turn of the century instruction in cooking and sewing (generally more ostentatiously termed "food preparation" and "textiles") was an increasingly important element in the state university's curriculum.

The point of these examples, of course, is to illustrate the immensely enlarged role that schools came to play in American society. This is not to say that informal education was insignificant but rather that formal education of the sort provided by schools, colleges, and universities assumes a heretofore unparalleled significance. The corollary to this assertion, then, is that educational opportunity in America at the turn of the century was significantly determined by the quality of the school or college to which an individual had access. Obviously if college admission now required a high school diploma the child whose community did not offer high school work was at an enormously serious handicap; indeed, more of a handicap that the child's parent who might have sought admission to the same college a generation earlier on the basis of examination. Similarly, the young person who wanted to teach elementary school who could have done so on the basis of an examination (which probably required competency to about the eighth grade level, if that) now must have completed high school or possibly even normal school.

Thus, a prime determinant of educational opportunity in turn of the century America was the quality of educational institutions to which one had access. One might argue that residence in midwestern America with its relative abundance of elementary and high schools and its widely available, inexpensive higher education was the optimum educational locale. Our traditional notions of factors affecting educational accomplishment have emphasized social, economic and racial factors. These obviously were very important. But in addition to these, I believe we must look even more closely at the availability and kinds of higher educational institutions. For example, a talented son of a moderately affluent white family in small town Iowa in 1900 might well expect to go to the nearest, inexpensive college, one located in Ames. There, if he were bright and took the most difficult course, he would likely choose engineering. Had the same boy lived in Boston he and his family would probably have pondered his vocational decision much more carefully before sending him for such specialized training at MIT. Certainly in New England in 1900 the standard curriculum for college boys was not engineering. Had this young man a younger sister, she might well have followed her brother to college at Ames and taken the home economic curriculum. Had they lived in New England, however, the finest colleges, which her brother could have attended, would have been closed to her. They were for men only. Further, the colleges in the east for women invariably emphasized a liberal arts program. Had the family lived in rural or small town south, even high school might not have been available to them in 1900.

This mythical brother and sister illustrate how differences in types of educational institutions available to them influenced their adult lives. Obviously such differences were less important when completion of high school or college was less crucial. Even more striking, of course, were the restrictions imposed upon black children in the south for whom no public high schools were open and for whom only scanty elementary training was possible. In rural areas throughout the country in 1900 high schools were sparse, and farm children who wished to leave the family farm (as many did) faced major obstacles to continuing their formal study.

What went on in these schools, attendance at which had become so important by 1900, was an altogether different and immensely complex question. My emphasis here, however, has been on three ideas: the necessity of doing research in history of education in this period on the status quo in education, not just on reform movements or subsequently important issues; secondly, on considering regional variables in assessing educational activities; and finally, on the primacy of the school in educational endeavors in turn of the century America.

However we may differ in our approaches to the history of American education, what is most impressive about the field at the moment is its vitality. We may be empiricists or humanists, historians of ideas or of institutions. Whichever positions seem most congenial, the field can only benefit from these varied studies we undertake.

THE HISTORY OF THE SOKAGAKKAI MOVEMENT AND ITS EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

by

Dr. Carl H. Gross
Professor of Education
Michigan State University

On October 12, 1972, the ceremony to report the completion of the Sho-Hondo took place at Taisekiji. This date had special significance for the followers of Nichiren Shoshu, for October 12, 1279, marked the date when the Nichiren Daishonin inscribed the Dai-Gohonzon which has become the supreme object of worship. For seven days ceremonies inaugurating the various areas of the new temple took place. The massive temple represents a gleaming white crane with outstretched wings as if about to take flight. There at the base of Mount Fuji the dream of Daisaku Ikeda, president of Soka Gakkai, was realized. In 1964 Ikeda had announced his plan for the construction of the new Sho-Hondo. The great drive for funds made in October of that year far surpassed the expectations of everyone. The goal was set for ¥1,000,000,000, or approximately $14,000,000. The drive lasted only four days, ¥35,536,004,300, or approximately $100,000,000 was raised. This figure is significant, when it is realized there were only 8,000,000 members and that less than 1.4% of the total amount was contributed by non-members. The per capita income of Japan at that time was about one-fourth of that in the United States, and Soka Gakkai's membership was composed of chiefly lower middle class or less. Since the 8 million members include minors, this successful fund raising drive is quite a tribute to the membership.

Thus, it is understandable that the ceremonies last fall dedicating the new temple were a high point in the history of the Soka Gakkai movement. The organization tries to impress its membership, as well as others, with its extravaganzas, whether they be musicals, cultural festivals, gymnastic performances, conventions, or new educational institutions. Since Soka Gakkai likes to overwhelm people with impressive statistics, a few figures will give some impression of this mammoth new temple. It is 330 meters long and 130 meters wide with a maximum height of 79 meters composed of 23,438 tons of steel and 118,476 tons of concrete, 9,746,624 man-hours of labor were needed to construct the edifice, pools, and fountains. The total cost for construction, land purchase and renovations was ¥47,182,821,070 approximately $157,276,070.

The purpose of erecting the Sho-Hondo was to provide a place where a large number of people could worship the Dai-Gohonzon. The mammoth size also reflects the spirit of the leadership of Soka Gakkai. It signifies achievement and success for the membership. The granite-paved staircase leading to the spacious Garden of Law is one hundred meters wide. In the center of this is found a pond in the shape of an eight petaled lotus blossom, which has a diameter of 62.7 meters. 187 jet nozzles send forth beautiful sprays, with the height of the main jet being 30 meters. The four areas of the temple are also symbolical. The first, the Garden of Law, leads to the Pavilion of Perfect Harmony. This is followed by the entrance hall, called the Temple of Purification, which leads to the Mystic Sanctuary, which resembles the holy of holies of ancient temples. The seats in the Mystic Sanctuary are in a staircase arrangement, so that all of the places for the 600 priests and the 5400 worshippers have an unobstructed view of the Dai-Gohonzon.

This grandest and most expensive of its monuments has been made possible through the spectacular growth of Soka Gakkai. Although Soka Kyoiku Gakkai (Value Creation Education Society) was formed in 1930 by Tsunesaburo Makiguchi, a Japanese teacher, Nichiren Shoshu goes back to the 13th Century. Nichiren Shoshu is the organization representing the religious aspect of Soka Gakkai. Komeito or Komei Party is its political arm. This interrelation with religion is an important element in the understanding of the meteoric rise of this sect, which suffered some tremendous setbacks during World War II. There were only 3000 members in 1941. When Daisaku Ikeda assumed the presidency in 1960, the membership included only 1,300,000 households. In 1967, this figure had risen to 6,400,000 households. At the time of the dedication of the new temple in 1972 the figure was listed as 7,570,000 families. The Japanese system of enumeration makes it somewhat difficult to ascertain the exact membership since these are often listed by households. Assuming that the average family contains three people, and that the entire family is a member of Soka Gakkai, the membership would be near 22,000,000 people. The tremendous early increases of Soka Gakkai have slowed in recent years. It is predicted that further expansion will be much slower. However, if the figures are accurate, about 20% of the Japanese are members of Soka Gakkai.

Tsunesaburo Makiguchi (1871-1944) was a relatively obscure elementary school principal, but his influence as founder of Soka Gakkai has become extensive. He is interesting from two facets, the founder of a powerful organization and as a seminal thinker in education. Thus, his writings form a philosophical basis for the organization, and also for the educational philosophy and practices now developed in the Soka Schools and the Soka University. The name Value Creation Society itself indicates an emphasis upon formal education. It also has a strong philosophical, particularly axiological, base. His book On Value published in 1931 contains a series of essays which he wrote in 1920. Although he did not seem powerful and his followers were relatively few prior to 1940, the Japanese military organization did not regard him as insignificant, as he was imprisoned during World War II. His pacifistic leanings were suspect. He died in prison from tuberculosis which resulted from malnutrition. Although his educational thought had little impact upon his contemporaries, he is now receiving more attention from scholars. His ideas were presented at a period of time when the environment was not conducive to his liberalism. There is much similarity to John Dewey. Unfortunately he wrote only in Japanese and his writings were not translated, so he had no audience beyond Japan. In addition, John Dewey's works were widely disseminated throughout the world.

The pedagogical writings of Makiguchi emphasize a system of knowledge which will develop man so that he can create values to guide his life. It should be noted that creation of values is the dominant theme, yet an absolutistic metaphysics is also present. Materials could not be created, but values could. Thus, education was very important.

Although Makiguchi emphasized several goals, the one overriding one was happiness. He tried to develop a definition of happiness which included both the personal and social aspects. He attempted to destroy the idea that wealth in itself produces happiness. In fact, he indicated that often it produces the opposite, as the wealthy person is always afraid that he will lose his money, and thus become miserable. The person who had given all his time to accumulate wealth for his children, but has neglected them in the process, finds that his children who have grown up without sound moral principles or have developed unsatisfactory lives and are not worthy of the sacrifices made to gain the wealth.

Makiguchi recognizes that the individual does not grow up in isolation, and the individual only gains happiness as a member of society. To make his point he uses the illustration of atoms. The nation flourishes as atoms combine, and the nation weakens as atoms scatter. The nation disintegrates as the atoms break up.

The human body can be sensed, but the spirit, which is also part of the being, cannot be sensed. Society likewise is not only an accumulation or collection of people, but it also has spiritual unity. He felt that man has no biological propensities to become a social being. If left alone, children can only develop l' entre individuel. As society develops, man realizes that he has weaknesses as an individual, and only through society does he achieve true individual fulfillment. In order to promote the best society schools are important. Teachers play the most important role. Makiguchi felt that since the educational system of Japan was national, there was a responsibility to increase the efficiency of teachers and guarantee good education for children. Teachers should be akin to artists who create values by their originality. They should have little interference. Only if they violate the laws of the country or do senseless things, should there be any restrictions. Their task is to help children achieve the greatest goal in life, namely, happiness.[1]

It is not surprising that as Soka Gakkai grew in numbers, wealth, and power that the organization gave serious attention to education. Josei Toda (1900-1958), the second president of Soka Gakkai, had also been a teacher. His great work was the expansion of the organization. He was responsible for changing the name from Skoa Kyoiku Gakkai (Value Creation Education Society) to Skoa Gakkai (Value Creation

Society). Although figures vary, the growth of the membership from less than a thousand households, when Toda assumed office in 1951, to over 1,050,000 when he died in 1958 is remarkable.[2]

A number of reasons have been advanced for this phenomenal growth:

1. The conditions of Japan after World War II, such as poverty, illness and dislocation, resulted in a disaffection with the past, and caused people to search for new beliefs and new institutions.

2. The decline of patriotism and loyalty after World War II made people ready to give their commitments to something other than the nation. For some, Soka Gakkai filled the void.

3. The new religions developing in Japan after World War II were often sampled by many Japanese. When they did not offer immediate relief from illness, poverty, and trouble, these individuals turned to other religions.

4. Japan's developing capitalism is still not shared by all the Japanese, and these alienated individuals are looking for a substitute for their own economic woes.

5. Democracy and rationalism have not truly been understood or accepted by large segments of the Japanese people.[3]

Soka Gakkai appealed to the forsaken, alienated and disenchanted for the following reasons:

1. The organization seemed to provide a solution to the individual's worldly difficulties. Their principles gave members a "logical" explanation of human life for the first time, and gave them confidence in their own ability to live in the world.

2. The movement is a manifestation of the contemporary Japanese religious outlook.

3. The movement contains emotional, revivalist, irrational, and magical elements which appeal to many people, especially those who are overwhelmed with problems which they do not personally seem able to resolve.

4. There is an essential Japanese flavor to the Soka Gakkai. Socialism and communism have a foreign flavor. A universal church built upon Nichiren's principles based in Japan has emotional and national appeal.

5. Their efficient organization and recruitment are effective.

6. There is a simplicity to the religion which appeals to many.

7. The charisma of Daisaku Ikeda, the present president, has been effective.

Although they have been severely criticized for their recruitment techniques, especially by Hirotatsu Fujiwara (I Denounce Soka Gakkai), the aggressive method of Shakubuku has been successful in many instances. According to members of Soka Gakkai, this is simply missionary work. According to critics, it involves forceful coercion. According to adherents it is merely talking about one's religion, the peace of mind received, and the achievement of happiness, the great goal of Soka Gakkai. Critics cite illustrations of threatened boycott to small businessmen if they would not join. Others claim that their homes were surrounded by chanting and singing members of Soka Gakkai, who supplemented their vocal efforts with beating of drums. It is said that some members joined in order to obtain peace, quietness, and some sleep.

Although Daisaku Ikeda was no teacher, as his predecessors in the presidency of Soka Gakkai had been, some outstanding developments have been made by the organization and have had his whole-hearted support. The Soka Schools for boys (Soka Junior High School and Soka Senior High School) were opened in March, 1968, in Musashino, a suburb 13 miles west of Tokyo. The buildings and facilities located on a 14-acre campus are truly impressive, far above average for Japan, and even for the United States. The symbolism of the Soka Gakkai philosophy of Wisdom, Glory, and Zeal are brought out in the pool and bridge harmonizing with the beautiful buildings. These contrast strikingly with the drab secondary schools found throughout Japan. The buildings include a 1,234 seat auditorium, where color of seats, walls, and stage curtains have been used to greatest advantage. The stage has the latest equipment, making possible the presentation of plays and pageants so dear to the Soka Gakkai. The two-story gymnasium has facilities for basketball, Ping-pong, kendo, and judo. Attached to the gymnasium is an outdoor 25-meter swimming pool. Tennis and volleyball courts and playfields for baseball and large group sports are also on the campus. A library with more than 10,000 books with a seating space for 125 is also impressive. the dining hall can accommodate 530. Modern classrooms for art, music, crafts, as well as the traditional subjects, are spacious and have incorporated the latest educational innovations. Laboratories for science and foreign languages are equipped with the latest technological equipment. Closely connected with the main campus when it was constructed were two dormitories: Daiichi-yo (First Dormitory) and Eiko-yo (Glory Domitory). A third has now been erected.

At present all the teachers in the Soka Schools are members of Soka Gakkai, but not all the students are. Ikeda announced at the entrance ceremonies that these schools were not established solely for members of Soka Gakkai, but for the hope of realizing human prosperity based on Buddhism coming into being. The five principles which he enunciated for the Soka Schools are:

1. Be a person who is wise, anxious to pursue truth, and create values.

2. Be responsible for your acts, and harm no one.

3. Be kind to others, have good manners, reject violence, and promote trust and harmony.

4. Stand up for what you believe, and courageously do the right.

5. Be a leader not only of Japan, but of the world, especially in developing world peace.

As happiness is the ultimate goal of Soka Gakkai, it is also the ultimate aim of education of the Soka Schools. The three school colors of blue, yellow, and red are symbolic for wisdom, glory, and enthusiasm, respectively. Knowledge is valuable only as it promotes wisdom. The best students each year, selected upon the basis of scholastic achievement, school activities, and personality, will be honored by having their names recorded in a lasting place on the campus for their own and their school's glory. Working hard to get ahead is honored, which is the personification of enthusiasm.

The Soka Schools are also committed to preparing the potential leaders of Japan for the twenty-first century. Through their screening process, Soka Gakkai educators feel they have chosen students destined for leadership positions. Some of the critics feel that this is a clandestine means of getting adherents to Soka Gakkai, and winning political power for the Komeito, the political party of Soka Gakkai.

The educational leaders have also talked about making the Soka Schools models for the educational system of Japan. Soka Gakkai favors more of the national budget being allotted to education. When the Soka Schools opened, they had a pupil teacher ratio of about 1:20, while that of Japan was 1:31 on the elementary level and 1:40 on the secondary level. From the latest reports they have not been able to maintain that favorable ratio, and when the writer last visited Soka Schools in 1972, the class sizes seemed to be nearly the same as those of the publicly supported schools. Had they been able to maintain their ratio and prove that they had a better educational system, then they could really have made a contribution as experimental schools.

Interestingly there is no evidence that religion is a formal subject in the curriculum. They also deny that there is indoctrination toward Soka Gakkai. However, the symbolism of the movement is bold and the atmosphere is in harmony with the aims of the Soka Gakkai. The principles stand out in the philosophy of the school; and are a vital force dominating each person's philosophy. The claim is made that Soka education is completely secular. Although each teacher supposedly has his own philosophy and religion, yet as mentioned previously, all the present faculty are members of Soka Gakkai. There is supposedly a unity of spirit in the school. It was also admitted that the hope was that all students would be idealists. The possibility for varying philosophies or attitudes, particularly on such issues as pacifism, seems limited. Ikeda feels that children learn much from the personality, affection, wisdom, and enthusiasm of the teacher. The principal normally stands at the gate each morning and greets each boy. He also eats lunch in the dining hall with the students. All teachers participate in the regular marathon races held at the school. The enrollment is given at 1500, (600 in junior high school and 900 in the senior high school).

School costs for tuition and board are about $500 a year (estimating the exchange rate at ¥300 to the dollar). The number of Japanese families who can afford this would be quite limited. Even though Japanese are willing to make major sacrifices for the education of their children, the costs are still high.

The Soka schools cost ¥1,600,000,000. The profit from the publications of Soka Gakkai paid for the capital outlay. The publications structure of Soka Gakkai and related agencies form the largest single publications organization in Japan.

Daisaku Ikeda is credited with initiating the idea of the Soka University, which was opened in April, 1971. He himself contributed ¥3,200,000,000or about $11,000,000) to it. ¥700,000,000 came from royalties on his books and ¥2,500,000,000 came from proceeds from Soka Gakkai that were made through the publication of his books. The original cost of the Soka University, built on a hillside overlooking a broad plain in Hachioji, west of Tokyo, was ¥6,000,000,000 (or about $20,000,000). The project is expected to cost ¥20,000,000,000 (or about $70,000,000) when completed.

The university began with three departments: law, economics, and literature. The land available permits the creation of 12 departments. A total of 7,825 students applied for admission to the three departments. The original capacity permitted an acceptance of 713 students.

The basic principles for Soka University were enunciated by Ikeda. They were:

1. The highest institution for human education
2. The cradle for a new culture
3. The fortress for the peace of mankind.

Accepting these principles Soka University hopes to build character through the development of intellect. Creativity is not to be neglected, which is to reflect itself in graduates being capable of fully employing highly advanced science and technology. These graduates through their rich intellect and creativity are expected to reshape society. It is claimed that modern civilization has come to a deadlock, so Soka University is expected to become a cradle for the creation of a new great culture. In order to become a comprehensive university science and engineering faculties are to be added. To spread its influence, it is anticipated that a correspondence education department and a night-school department will be added so that all people may benefit from liberal education.

"Soka University has a number of ambitious projects. Among them are the dispatch of an academic expedition along the 'Silk Trade Route' which served in the history of Asia as a bridge between the Oriental and Occidental civilizations, and an on-the-spot study of the ancient 'Yamatai Country,' which is believed to be a clue to the origin of Japan and the Japanese people. Another important projected task is to establish a new science, 'humanistic economics' which includes theoretical and practical studies of the development of a new economy for mankind, transcending both capitalism and socialism. Still another task is to institute a new study of history--that is, the establishment of a 'humanistic concept of history' based on the philosophy of life as contrasted with the spiritualistic and materialistic concepts of history."[4]

The school year is divided into three semesters of ten weeks each. One appealing feature for the faculty is the plan to free professors one semester each year for writing, research, and overseas research tour. At present 60% of the faculty are members of Soka Gakkai. There is no plan to open a class on the science of religion.

On April 11, 1973, the latest educational institution of Soka Gakkai was opened. This was the Soka Girls' Junior and Senior High Schools in Katano City near Osaka. Consistent with the two previous institutions much attention has been given to the landscaping and structure. Located in a beautiful natural setting the strikingly modernistic buildings offer unique facilities contrasting sharply with the universal drab and stark buildings in the public school system. Artistry is emphasized through colors, contrasting bricks and concrete, ponds, bright interiors. The slogans established for the school by Ikeda are sound judgement, good health and hope. The mottos of the school are:

"1) Be women respected and loved by all. Always be bright and vivid in action, and warm and noble in heart.

2) Be women of wisdom, studying with burning desire for creativity, cultivating sound judgement, and constantly working toward self-improvement.

3) Be kind and polite women with a broad outlook, yet be attentive to minute matters, understanding the situation of others as well.

4) Be women of strong will, respecting life, opening the way for peace and happiness of mankind."[5]

Though the growth rate of Soka Gakkai and the rise of Komeito to the third strongest party in Japan is phenomenal, it appears as if a plateau has been reached. The educational developments of Soka Gakkai are impressive, if for no other reason than the establishment of the Soka Secondary Schools for Boys, the Soka Secondary Schools for Girls, and the Soka University. The writer is not aware of any future plans for additional schools. Since the proposed plans for the university are extensive, these will most probably occupy their attention and test their ability to financially support their grandiose plans. It will be interesting to watch if the educational institutions will become experimental or merely continue the same curriculum and methodology of Japan. Makiguchi was an able critic of Japanese education. His philosophy had many similarities to Dewey's. He was truly a seminal thinker. His works are worthy of realization in the Soka schools and university. In fact, they are worthy of study by Japanese, and even foreign, educators.[6]

NOTES

[1] For further treatment of this entire subject see Carl H. Gross, Sokagakkai and Education (East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University, 1970).

[2] Hirotatsu Fujiwara, I Denounce Soka Gakkai (Tokyo: Nisshin Hodo Co., 1970), p. 81.

[3] Kazuo Kazahara, "Soka Gakkai and Komeito", Japan Quarterly, vol. XIV, no. 3 (July-September, 1967) pp. 311-317; Hiroo Takagi, "The Rise of the New Religions", Japan Quarterly, vol. XL, no. 3 (July-September, 1964), pp. 283-292; Ivan Morris, "The Challenge of Soka Gakkai", Encounter (May, 1966), pp. 78-83.

[4] Soka University (no date nor pagination).

[5] Center for Humanistic Education (no copyright nor pagination).

[6] Dayle M. Bethel, Makiguchi the Value Creator (New York: Weatherhill, 1973) for further treatment of this entire subject.

Bibliography

Books

Ballon, Robert J., Doing Business in Japan. Tokyo: Sophia University, 1968.

Bethel, Dayle M., Makiguchi: The Value Creator. New York: John Weatherhill, Inc., 1973.

Buck, Pearl S., The People of Japan. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1966.

Center for Humanistic Education. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, 1973.

Fujiwana, Hirotatsu, I Denounce Soka Gakkai. Tokyo: Nisshin Hodo Co., 1970.

Gross, Carl H., Sokagakkai and Education. East Lansing, Michigan, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1970.

Ikeda, Daisaku, Complete Works of Daisaku Ikeda. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, 1963.

Ikeda, Daisaku, The Human Revolution. 3 vols. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, 1966.

Ikeda, Daisaku, Youth, Let's Advance Towards a New Day. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, 1968.

Kodairo, Hohei, Soka Gakkai. Tokyo: Hoshoin, 1968.

Makiguchi, Tsunesaburo, Makiguchi Tsunesaburo Zenshu (Complete Works of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi). 5 vols. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, 1925.

Makiguchi, Tsunesaburo, Philosophy of Value. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, 1964.

Mori, Hideto, System of Soka Gakkai. Tokyo: Sanpo Co., Ltd., 1963.

Nichiren Shoshu Sokagakkai. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, 1966. (no author cited).

Soka University. Tokyo: The Seikyo Press, (no date given).

Takase, Horoi, Daisaku Ikeda Who Aims at Human Revolution. Tokyo: Yuki Shobo, 1965.

Thomsen, Harry, The New Religions of Japan. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1963.

Tokyo University Study Group of Hokkekyo. Nichiren Shoshu Soka Gakkai. Tokyo: Yamaki ho hutsu shorin, 1962.

Articles, Brochures, Magazines, Newspapers

Adams, Andy, "Sokagakkai Leader Defines Aims." Japan Times, January 25, 1967.

"A New Faith Called Soka Gakkai Raises Old Problems in Modern Japan." Look, vol. 27, part 3, (September 10, 1963).

"An Explanation for Kaidan." Sunday Mainichi. November 14, 1966.

Baba, Kyoko, "Soka Gakkai--Business Tool or Threat?" Japan Times, September 30, 1965, p. 5.

"Clear Ideals or Aims of Soka School." Todai, 61 (November, 1967), pp. 32-35.

"'Complete Neutrality' best for Japan: Komeito." Japan Times, December 7, 1967.

Editorial, "Shakubuku and Group Zadankai." Seikyo Newspaper, no. 526 (June 6, 1961).

"Enlightenment of Wisdom and Creative Ability" ("Chie, Sozoryoku o Keihatsu"). Seikyo Newspaper, November 5, 1967, p. 5.

"For the Public Welfare" (Komeito's Policies I). Tokyo, Komeito Newspaper Company, 1966, pp. 255-257.

Ikeda, Daisaku, "Celebrate the Entrance Ceremony of Soka Gakuen." Seikyo Newspaper, April 4, 1968, p. 1.

Info. Tokyo, The Seikyo Press.

"Japan." Time, 83, (May 22, 1964), p. 42.

Kasahara, Kazuo, "Soka Gakkai and Komeito." Japan Quarterly, vol. XIV, no. 3, (July-September, 1967), pp. 311-317.

Kashiwabara, Yasu, "Education is an Art." Todai, January, 1968, pp. 38-39.

Katsura, Hirosuke, "Bright Children in School and Eisai in Industry." Todai, October, 1967, pp. 28-31.

Koito, Chugo, "Youth and Religion." Japan Times, October 2, 1962.

Komeito Press Releases (mimeographed news releases). Tokyo, Komeito's Organ Paper Bureau.

Lynch, John, "Letter from Japan." America, vol. 107, no. 16 (July 21, 1962), pp. 528-529.

McCrimmon, Mary, "From Christianity to Soka Gakkai." The Japan Missionary Bulletin, vol. XVIII (July, 1964), pp. 297-402.

Morris, Ivan, "The Challenge of 'Soka Gakkai'," Encounter, May, 1966, pp. 78-83.

Murata, Kiyoaki, "A Battle of Faiths." Japan Times, November 2, 1965, p. 12.

"New Religion Disturbs Japanese Politics." Christian Century, vol. 81 (July 29, 1964).

Nichiren Shoshu Sokagakkai. Tokyo, Seikyo Press (no author or date presented).

Nichiren Shoshu Sokagakkai Photographic 1968. Tokyo, The Seikyo Press, 1968.

O'Grady, Desmond, "Religion and Politics in Japan." America, vol. 108, no. 5 (February 2, 1963), pp. 172-174.

Olson, Lawrence, "A Note on Japan." East Asia Series, vol. XIII, no. 4, American University Field Staff Reports Service, 1965.

Olson, Lawrence, "Value Creation Society." East Asia Series, vol. XI, no. 6, American University Field Staff Reports, 1964.

"Resurgent Buddhism of the Soka Gakkai." Christianity Today, vols. 81 and 82 (July 22, 1964; February 3, 1965, May 7, 1965).

Sasai, Tsunezo, "Sokagakkai Press Answers Queries," Mainichi, May 3, 1967.

"School Which Has Unlimited Dreams." Todai, February, 1968, pp. 34-38.

Seikyo Bulletins. Tokyo, The Seikyo Press.

Seikyo Times. Tokyo, The Seikyo Press.

"Sokagakkai Collected 35,000,000,000 Yen in Four Days." Sunday Mainichi, November 14, 1965, pp. 12-17.

Soka University. The Soka University Preparatory Foundation, Tokyo.

Tada, Shogo, "Sound Eisai Education Which Is Needed." Todai, October, 1967, pp. 12-15.

Takagi, Hiroo, "The Rise of the New Religions." Japan Quarterly, vol. XI, no. 3 (July-September, 1964), pp. 283-292.

The Seikyo Graphic. Tokyo, The Seikyo Press.

Toshihiro, Suzuki, "Letter from Soka School" ("Sokagakuen Dayori"). Todai, vol. 68 (June, 1968), pp. 96-97.

"Toward a Great Mission to Establish State-supported Kaidan." Seikyo Press, no. 171 (April 24, 1955), p. 1.

Tsuchiya, Minoru, "Desirable Personality Build-Up of Education." Todai, no. 65 (March, 1968), pp. 16-19.

Tsuji, Takehisa, "Discovery and Cultivation of Wisai," Todai, October, 1967.

Tsuji, Takehisa, "Sound and Humanistic Geniuss-ism." Todai, November, 196;, pp. 16-19.

Universal Information Service. Komeito Press Release, Tokyo.

A. S. NEILL AND THE ANARCHIST TRADITION

by

Joseph Kirschner
Youngstown State University

On September 24, 1973 A. S. Neill passed away, just short of his ninetieth birthday. With Neill's death a decent, humane, witty, pro-life individual as well as a vital link in the anarchist (or libertarian) tradition is gone.

Neill leaves behind a legacy of commitment to helping young people free themselves from the molding forces of social institutions. His school, Summerhill, as a self-governing, non-coercive school-as-community, epitomizes the anarchist tradition in education.[1] The primary purpose of this paper is to probe for connections between this tradition and A. S. Neill. How did he come to be, by 1915, a part of this tradition? What were the influences? What made him receptive to them?

We begin with an examination of the broader anarchist tradition. What one finds at its core is not only a resentment of the repressiveness of institutions such as schools, but a concern over what is seen as life and death forces in society, and a faith in small communities being able to influence larger social systems.

Like progressivism, anarchism is a multi-stranded macramé. While the word "anarchism" does not emerge in Western political thought as a label for a point of view until 1840 in Pierre-Joseph Proudhon's "What is Property? First Memoir,"[2] the sentiment, the concern, is part of a larger libertarian tradition in the West--an assertion of the primacy of the individual over society. While this tradition has roots in antiquity (as in the teachings of the Greek and Roman stoics) it was refocused in a political way through the writings of Proudhon in France and William Godwin in England.

By the mid-nineteenth century the triumph of capitalism and industrialism in the West brought to the fore a real crisis for the libertarian tradition with a resultant belief emerging among some that the interests of the powerless might best be served through some form of socialism (public ownership of the means of production) as a vehicle to offset exploitation. A variety of socialists emerged. In an attempt to bring these socialists together the First Internationale (of the International Workingmen's Association) was convened in September of 1864. However, a split occurred between the followers of Marx, or collectivist statists, and the followers of Bakunin, or anarcho-communalists. It is the latter, or anarchist wing, that carried the libertarian tradition into the twentieth century.

Among the anarchists there developed two responses to power in the modern nation-state. One was a political direct-action response as exemplified in "the propaganda of the word and deed" of such people as Michael Bakunin, Francisco Ferrer, and Emma Goldman who actively sought political means to liberation. The other response was more nearly a philosophical and literary one as exemplified in the writings of people such as Leo Tolstoy and Peter Kropotkin. These people engaged in a running commentary on social ills and repressive social forms while sketching the outlines of what the ideal communist society would be like. While this political-philosophical distinction may appear somewhat artificial it is useful for the purpose of analyzing and understanding the anarchist tradition.

Philosophical anarchism, both in its affirmations and protestations, also has important roots in the romantic tradition of Rousseau and Nietzsche. Its affirmation resides in a faith in the basic goodness of life, of the unfettered, free, natural person. Its protestations lie in attacks on the fetters of society *qua* society, its various institutions, its ideologies, and, for Freudian romantics and anarchists of the 1920's, the fetters of repressed impulses.

Both perspectives, the political as well as the philosophical,[3] have had an influence on free schools. Some quite political figures (such as Francisco Ferrer) as well as philosophical ones (such as Leo Tolstoy) even ran free schools. In the philosophical anarchist tradition we find A. S. Neill. His life was a testament to the protest and affirmation of this romantic, anarchist tradition which holds that the school, as a social institution, inescapably is a constraining, molding, anti-life force. Neill's Summerhill School is a response and reaction to schooling as molding--his is what Ray Hemmings refers to as an anti-school school, a deschooled school.[4]

While Neill denied any awareness of anarchism by name[5] he seemed to soak up a kind of philosophical anarchism through his Scottish tradition, family background, and most powerfully his interest in the theatre, particularly what Robert Brustein calls the theatre of revolt.

The essence of anarchism that the theatre brought to Neill (through Henrik Ibsen, particularly) is a feel for the conflict between pro-life and anti-life forces in society--a metaphor that Neill used often in his writings. It is during his years as a student at Edinburgh University that Neill discovered Ibsen and Shaw. While a student he was an editor (1910-1912) of the school paper, *The Student*. As editor he received free tickets to plays and operas. Through this experience with theatre and non-required reading of such writers as Tolstoy and Nietzsche (the latter having a significant impact on him) he began consciously thinking in terms of life forces. While Shaw probably provided the label, Neill's use of the idea is closer in spirit to Bergson's *élan vital*, more of an emotional than an intellectual commitment, more anarchistic.[6] Neill's interest in theatre, and most specifically Ibsen's *An Enemy of the*

People, was the vital encounter with anarchism and the radical tradition.

That drama can be a significant, consciousness-raising force is cogently described by Emma Goldman in an essay written around 1911 entitled "The Modern Drama: A Powerful Disseminator of Radical Thought."[7] In this essay Ibsen gets considerable attention as "the supreme hater of all social shams."[8] His greatest onslaught, according to Goldman, was on the four cardinal points that support our flimsy society.

> First, the life upon which rests the life of today; second, the futility of sacrifice as preached by our moral codes; third, petty material consideration, which is the only god the majority workships; and fourth the deadening influence of provincialism.[9]

This is the essential protest of the young Neill. But Ibsen, and young Neill, not only protest but affirm.

As Goldman observes:

> Ibsen's destructive effects are at the same time supremely constructive, for he not merely undermines existing pillars; indeed, he builds with sure strokes the foundations of a healthier, ideal future, based on the sovereignty of the individual within a sympathetic social environment.[10]

Here is the anarchist affirmation, here is the Summerhill ideal.

Two examples should serve to illustrate the impact on Neill of An Enemy of the People. Writing in 1915 in A Dominie's Log, essentially a log of his experiences as a headmaster at Gretna Green School,[11] Neill makes the following observation:

> Nearly every day I quote to my bairns Ibsen's words from An Enemy of the People . . . . . "The Majority never has right on its side. Never I say." Every lesson book shouts aloud the words: "The majority is always right."
>
> Do I teach my bairns Socialism? I do not think so. Socialism means the owning of a State by the people of that State, and this State is not fit to own anything.[12]

Later, he again refers to this play as he was re-reading it one night and

> the thought suddenly came to me: "Would my bairns understand it?" . . . . It was peculiarly satisfying to me to find that they recognized Dr. Stockmann as a better man than his grovelling brother Peter. If my bairns could realize

> the full significance of Ibsen's play, "The Day" would not be so far off as I am in the habit of thinking it is.[13]

Obviously one play, or several, or many, including those of a Shaw or a Galsworthy could never fully explain the heightening social consciousness that Neill experienced between 1904 when he was "full of zeal for the Tory Party,"[14] and 1915 when he penned the above. Still, Neill's attraction to libertarian socialism, or Guild Socialism,[15] or philosophical anarchism, was powerfully shaped by his experience with the theatre.

In order to gain some insight into Neill's receptiveness to people such as Ibsen, Shaw, H. G. Wells, and Nietzsche and why this receptiveness helped form Neill's libertarianism, it might be helpful to look at those events in his early years that tilled the ground for the receptive Neill of Edinburgh University and the "London years" (1910-1914). Neill's receptiveness to radical thought grew out of internalized conflicts such as: Scottish nationalism versus internationism, religion versus anti-religion, laborer versus intellectual, mass versus elite, authority versus freedom. Such conflicts served to heighten a concern over class and status.

Evidence of class tension was apparent in the Neill household from young Neill's earliest days. His father, George Neill, came from a family of miners that was headed by William MacNeill. All the male members of his family were miners except George who was sent to school to become a teacher. Subsequently, George Neill gained a teaching post at Kingsmuir school just outside Forfar, Scotland in 1876.[16] Why did he drop the prefix "Mac"? Neill remarked that he never knew the reason.[17] Did this serve to place distance between rough, course miners and the genteel schoolmaster?

Suggestive of distance is the fear George Neill seemed to have for his father. He was always a little strained when his father came to stay with the Neills.[18] And the tension even built up in his wife who resented the fact that old William MacNeill refused to wear a collar but wore a black handerchief instead.[19]

Young Neill shared the tension. He admired how distinguished his grandfather looked and his ability to make a fine fiddle with a penknife. But, to young Neill, worse than not wearing a collar was the cackle in his grandfather's throat and in inclination to spit anywhere.

In a very personal way we can see the young Neill having to internalize an attraction and repulsion to the ways of his grandfather. While little is known either of the politics of his grandfather or the views he expressed in the Neill household, a look at the tradition of Scottish miners might provide suggestive leads to influences on Neill's libertarian socialism.

In the early 1880's Henry George, the advocate of a single tax on rent, had "toured Scotland and fixed the masses of men with his passion and his eloquence, and among those he influenced most was James Keir Hardie, the young leader of the Lanarkshire miners. . . ."[21] By the year 1888 Hardie was preaching "Christian Socialism" and editing the Miner---an influential monthly journal for miners that was started in January of 1887.[22] This same James Keir Hardie, who by 1905 was viewed as one of the recognized leaders of the Labour Party,[23] had, along with other socialists, founded county and district miners unions in Scotland in the 1880's and 1890's,[24] Hardie was particularly known, up until he stood for Parliament in 1888, as a leader of Scottish miners, particularly those in the Lanarkshire and Ayrshire Miners' Unions.[25]

Thus we can see that in the 1880's and '90's, during Neill's childhood, miner unrest and organizing in Scotland was at a peak. So, while the political and mining activity of Neill's paternal grandfather and uncles remain hidden to this researcher one suspects that they were quite involved. Surely, the dynamism and strength of old William MacNeill is suggestive of more than a passive miner in the County of East Lothian. Maybe the comparative conservatism of miners here is why he left mining by the early 1880's and went into business for himself.

If Neill felt an attraction toward as well as a revulsion from his grandfather, he never felt close to his father until much later in life. His father, Neill felt, did not even care for him as a child.

> Often he was cruel to me, and I acquired a definite fear of him, a fear that I never quite overcame in manhood. I see now that Father did not like any children; he had no contact with them.[26]

Before one concludes that Neill's appetite for freedom has been solely a reaction against repressive upbringing Ray Hemmings urges us to note the dedication in Neill's first book.

> As a boy I attended a village school where the bairns chattered and were happy. I trace my love of freedom to my free life there, and I dedicated this book to my former Dominie, my Father.[27]

As Hemmings correctly observes, as far as schooling was concerned Neill's early revulsion for authoritarian teachers came from his experience as an assistant teacher at Kingskettle School "where he spent three wretched years [1903-1906] under a headmaster whom he later described as a 'sadistic tyrant' who 'taused the pupils most savagely and expected me to do likewise'."[28]

In recalling his father's attitude towards children Neill concluded that all his father cared about were kids who were good at school lessons. Since Neill was not good at lessons nor could he adjust to laboring jobs, he seemed destined to becoming a teacher. An exchange Neill remembers sums it up nicely:

> "The Boy's just hopeless," said my father gloomily. "He might be a teacher," ventured my mother. "It's about all he's fit for," said my father grimly, and without a smile.[29]

The one positive thing Neill felt he did learn from his father was about good teaching---"good in the sense he could draw out rather than stuff in."[30]

Neill felt much closer to his mother. "As a boy I loved my mother deeply--loved her too much--but at that age, I could not love my father. He was too stern, too far away from me."[31]

Others too, influenced Neill. Neill's maternal grandmother, Granny Clunes Sinclair Sutherland, was one. Born to a farmer with small holdings in Caithness, she was one of twenty sons and daughters "all [of whom] died of tuberculosis except herself."[32] Granny moved to Leith, became a servant girl, got married, lost her husband in a drowning and then took in washing to support her family. Through apparently much sacrifice her only daughter, Mary Sutherland (Neill's mother), was able to become a teacher in Leith where she subsequently met Neill's father.[33]

Granny Sinclair moved in to live with the Neill's and remained until her death, and although Neill attributes his early fear of hell to her he was quite fond of her.[34] The religious tension Neill felt was heightened by his closeness to his sister, Clunie, who never compromised her atheism until 1918 when, on her deathbed, dying of pneumonia at the age of thirty-four, she "kept muttering prayers she had learned as a baby, imploring God to save her soul."[35]

The Neill household was dominated by strong drive for status and young Neill was not to begin freeing himself from this drive until at least his "London years" (1912-1914). Neill recalls an incident that points up this status drive in his mother. His father neither drank nor smoked. Nor had he any games or hobbies. "Once he tried to join in a village game of quoits but my mother put her foot down: 'George Neill, think of your position! You can't lower yourself to play games with plowmen and railwaymen'."[36] His mother even forced Neill and his brothers and sisters to speak proper English in the house, "but of course we spoke broad Forfarshire outside . . . . The inside boots automatically became bates when we talked to Jock Broon."[37]

What does all this biographical data suggest? It suggests a youngster shaped by a variety of forces resulting in an ambivalent attitude towards religion as well as lower class, middle class, and even upper class life styles.

Neill's interest in theatre referred to earlier was intimately related to his class consciousness. And this interest became more intense when reinforced by pleasurable feelings in being in a theatre surrounded by elegance and elegant people. In his autobiography he refers to brief political efforts as a Tory in 1904 in Kingskettle. He then recalls going to the theatre. This in turn brought forth a memory of his first play, A Night of Pleasure, which he saw at the age of twelve in Edinburgh's

Theatre Royal. "For me it certainly was a night of bliss, for I had never seen such visions of radiant loveliness in my life."38 This sense of wonder of the theatre, the setting as well as the drama, was as intense seven years later in 1902 when he attended the theatre in Edinburgh while visiting his brother, Neilie, a medical student there.39

In 1906 Neill moved to Newport, a fairly middle-class community where he took up a teaching post. Newport provided an opportunity for Neill to realize his more snobbish dreams. As he observed, in

> Forfar and elsewhere, my class status had been fixed; but here in Newport, I saw that Willsher [the headmaster] and the other teachers were hail-fellow-well-met with the goodly citizens and, even as an ex-student teacher without a university degree, I might also be in good society.40

Newport also meant contact with the cultural life of nearby Dundee, with its lively theatre, opera, and music.41

During these years Neill evidenced signs of wanting to be different. While he usually had a perversity of dress such as wearing a highly colored waistcoat or open-necked, colored shirt, yet he was cautious.

> I was too much afraid for alienating the little circle I had entered, for status was the one thing that mattered to me then. I was interested in society only as an external thing, rather than as a means towards gaining artistic or intellectual culture.42

This fear was re-inforced by an incident. Neill once lent H. G. Well's Marriage to a girl of sixteen and was accused by her father of being a dangerous seducer.43

Not only did culture and status sometimes clash in Neill's world but so did Neill's life style clash with memories of that of the poor of Dundee that Neill had met in 1902 while making rounds with Neilie while he was doing his obstetrical cases there. "We entered houses that were hovels, where women labored in beds swarming with lice."44 While Neill denies that these visits made him conscious of social ills45 one suspects later experiences brought back some vivid images.

Neill's years at Edinburgh University (1909-1912) were selftesting years. Here he found himself as a writer. While reading Honors English he also convinced himself that he had intellectual and academic abilities and wasn't the academic misfit his father saw. It was however not until after 1915 that he would begin to find himself as a teacher.

The anarchic, iconclastic Neill first became manifest to a larger public by means of his editorials in The Student (1911-1912). He wrote on a variety of issues including, for the first time, teaching. He attacked the snobbishness and apathy of the students as well as their shallowness. He observed that personally "we are revolutionary, anarchic, yet our one amibition is to have a pair of spats."[46] Continuing in an almost Shavian vein he notes:

> Religion and social convention are at one in decreeing that humility is a virtue . . . they are responsible for the cowardly hypocrisy we call self-depreciation.[47]

He also attacked the examination system and the professors who he decided:

> are not real teachers at all, but merely lecturers . . . . They [the professors] stand upon their dignity and their whole attitude says, 'I don't want any of your familiarity. I am a Professor.'[48]

Neill's shift from Tory to Socialist was completed during the two years after he left Edinburgh (1913-15). During these years he took up editorial work on Fleet Street in London. When he was appointed Art Editor of a new literary magazine, The Picadilly, he met a variety of people including Alec Waugh and H. G. Wells. But the guns of August silenced this venture.

So, although he went back to teaching (at Gretna Green in Scotland) he did manage to subscribe to and to do some writing for a radical weekly, The New Age[49] (the organ of Guild Socialism), in an attempt to fight what he felt was the deadening impact of small town Scottish provincialism.

Any informed, socially-conscious Briton of those years subscribed to The New Age, particularly in the years immediately preceding World War One. After 1911 A. R. Orage and S. G. Hobson headed up The New Age and led a "plea to capture control in industry by National Guilds."[50] The influence behind these Guilds was French Syndicalism and American trade Unionism.[51] In speaking of Guild Socialism G. D. H. Cole observes that much of it had been anticipated by the Socialist League in the 1880's which by 1889 had come under anarchist control and, like syndicalism, drew heavily on anarchist ideas of social organization.[52] Another influence on Guild Socialism was Robert Owens and his 1824 description of "villages of Cooperation" essentially cooperative or socialist communes.[53]

Guild Socialism not only influenced Neill, but he came to see himself as a Guild Socialist. As he explicitly affirmed in 1915: "I believe in Socialism--the Guild Socialism of The New Age."[54]

To better understand Neill's commitment to libertarian socialism, or anarchism, one other tradition in British socialism needs to be mentioned--Fabian socialism. In 1884 George Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb founded the Fabian Society.[55] While their socialism was a powerful influence on the shaping of the Labour Party, it was a socialism different from both marxism and anarchism in that it drew on the thought of Mills and Jevons and advocated the "greatest happiness for the greatest number by state intervention and control of means of production, distribution and exchange."[56]

Such a socialism Neill found hopelessly bureaucratic. In his *A Dominie's Log* he speaks of government bullying people; the police bullying everyone who hasn't a clean collar; the dominie bullying the young; and the School Board bullying the teacher. "Yet in theory," he continues,

> the judge, the constable, the dominie, and the School Board are the servants of democracy. Heaven help us from the bureaucratic Socialism of people like the Webbs!... Paradoxically, I, as a Socialist, believe that the one thing that will save the people is individualism.[57]

Not a paradox for one in the anarchist tradition!

It now remains for us to look at another influence shaping Neill's anarchist commitment, the Scottish nationalism of the middle classes. The Scottish tradition seems to have a strong anarchist as well as authoritarian strain. Referring to a kind of "remote anarchism" in Scotland, Muriel Spark, in an essay, "What Images Return,"[58] observes that Edinburgh's Castle Rock, that "great primitive black crag," along side all the government buildings makes the whole governmental bureaucracy just a bit ridiculous. In describing her overall reaction to Edinburgh (a town that was like a magnet for the youthful Neill) she notes:

> I imbibed, through no particular mentor, . . . its haughty and remote anarchism. I can never now suffer from a shattered faith in politics and politicians, because I never had any.[59]

And neither had Neill, except for the quite brief venture in politics in 1904 in the Tod-Asquith race for M.P. from East Fife.

In addressing himself to that *bête noire* of Neill's, the role of the Scottish Kirk, Tom Nairn, in "Three Dreams of Scottish Nationalism," limns a tension between authority and anarchy in Scotland.

> In the dreadful, chronic anarchy and medieval poverty of Scotland, the [religious revolt of John Knox in the 1560's] represented the one great effort of the Scottish people towards a meaningful order of their own.[60]

In a country "poisoned by state authoritarianism" Nairn saw the revolt of youth in the 1960's against authoritarianism as having quite a special sense and value.[61] Expressing a reaction to authority that is virtually right out of Neill's writings Nairn describes Scottish middle classes as committed to a "junta of corporal-punishers and kirk-going cheese-parers."[62]

Arthur Warwick, expressing a similar concern in an essay, "Scottish Nationalish Since 1918," applied his analysis to Scotland's educational system which he viewed as "pre-eminent only, it seems, in the use of corporal punishment."[63]

The Scottish middle class that so appealed to Neill had, until the 1910's tended to ape the English. Tom Nairn comments on the consequences of this phenomenon.

> This is the whole sense of the Calvinist mentality: cringing observance of external forms, for worldly purposes, contemptuous disregard of them on another level.[64]

The middle classes of Scotland also seemed to have a commitment to sentimentality reflected in what Nairn calls "the division between the Scottish head and the Scottish heart that history had . . . produced."[65] Such a separation between heart and head definitely concerned Neill. He tended to view schools as being committed to heads and not hearts and thus to a molding of minds that he wished to offset by providing a setting that would, in freeing the emotions of the heart, free the intellect.[66]

One other aspect of Neill, his search for pro-life community, can also be seen through the glass of Scottish nationalism with its dream for wholeness, for life. Observes Nairn, this dream while "misplaced, sentimental, archaic, is nonetheless a dream of wholeness--a wholeness which will express life instead of hiding it. . . . It is a dream of release and affirmation shared by many . . ."[67] including A. S. Neill of Angus County.

Let us now take stock of what we have been trying to do here. I have argued that Neill was strongly influenced by the anarchist, libertarian tradition in the West. Thus when we find Neill protesting authoritarianism and the molding of people to adapt to a sick society, we discover that this protest is the anarchist protest against the necrophillic state with its institutions that thwart and distort the biophillic impluse of individuals.

Our task here has been to show that while there is little in Neill's writings to indicate an awareness of anarchist political thinkers such as Bakunin, Kropotkin, Proudhon, and Godwin, there is influence from the anarchist tradition.

The rise of commerce and industry in the West has brought with it the idea of mass society populated with personnel whose function it is to serve the organization. But such a function is rarely satisfying for in particular situations people usually seem to recall a lost "golden age" where it is believed a sense of community once obtained, where people found satisfaction, happiness, and meaning in work and community living, however much romanticizing that may be involved.

Thus, the anarchist vision! Applied to schools it stressed the aim of liberating the spontaneous, growing individual within a supportive school community. It stressed learning and expression rather than teaching, or freedom to develop according to one's abilities rather than the dictates of timetables, syllabi, and discipline.[68]

The anarchist vision viewed in a broader context is a vision of individuals spontaneously and voluntarily working together for group goals, and groups cooperating for broader goals without authoritarian restraints. It is a vision shared in recent years by people such as Paul Goodman and Paulo Freire, as well as A. S. Neill. Their fundamental commitment has been with fostering love, a balance of emotionality and rationality, and creativity – a humanist commitment.

Notes

1 This tradition seems to be what Roger Woock is describing in his paper "Toward a Marxist Critique of the Romantic Critics" where he speaks of perspectives shared by those he calls "the romantic school critics" such as Paul Goodman, Edgar Friedenberg, A. S. Neill, John Holt, Herbert Kohl, Jonathan Kozol, and others. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, (Chicago, April, 1972).

2 Steward Edwards (ed.), *Selected Writings of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, Elizabeth Fraser (tr.), (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1969), p. 88.

3 I am indebted to Robert Brustein and his *Theatre of Revolt* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964), p. 25, for the political-philosophical distinction.

4 Fifty Years of Freedom: A Study of the Development of the Ideas of A. S. Neill (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1972), pp. 193-194.

5 Letter from A. S. Neill to Joseph Kirschner, March 27, 1973.

6 For insights into Neill's early years I have drawn heavily on his latest autobiography, "*Neill!, Neill! Orange Peel!*" (New York: Publishing Co., 1972).

7 Emma Goldman, Anarchism and Other Essays (New York: Dover Publications, 1969). This is an unaltered republication of the third edition of 1917.

8 Ibid., p. 253.

9 Ibid., p. 253.

10 Ibid., p. 259. Emphasis added.

11 "Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!", p. 139.

12 *A Dominie's Log*, p. 29. Emphasis in original.

13 Ibid., pp. 60-61.

14 "Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!", p. 104.

15 A Dominie's Log, p. 88.

16 Ray Hemmings, op. cit., p. 1.

17 "Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!", p. 23.

18 Ibid.

19 Ibid., p. 29.

20 Ibid.

21 Thomas Johnston, The History of the Working Classes in Scotland (Glasgow: Forward Publishing Coy [sic], Ltd., n.d. (1912?)), p. 263.

22 Ibid., p. 393.

23 Roy Gregory, The Miners and British Politics, 1906-1914 (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 73.

24 Ibid., p. 90.

25 G. D. H. Cole, British Working Class Politics, 1832-1914 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1941), p. 105.

26 "Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!", p. 31. Emphasis in original.

27 A Dominie's Log, Frontispiece.

28 Hemmings, op. cit., p. 2. Id. Journal of the Summerhill Society, p. 2, (September, 1960): 3.

29 "Neill! Neill! Orange Peel!", p. 89.

30 Ibid., p. 89.

31 Ibid., p. 61.

32 Ibid., p. 24.

33 Ibid., p. 24.

34 Ibid., p. 25.

35 Ibid., p. 26.

36 Ibid., p. 32.

37 Ibid., p. 33.

38 Ibid., p. 104.

39 Ibid., p. 105.

40 Ibid., pp. 105-106.

41 Ibid., pp. 109-110.

42 Ibid., pp. 111-112.

43 Ibid., p. 112.

44 Ibid., p. 111.

45 Ibid.

46 Quoted in Hemmings, op. cit., p. 7. The volume of The Student containing Neill's editorials is no longer on file at Edinburgh University.

47 Ibid.

48 Ibid., p. 8.

49 Ibid., p. 21.

50 G. D. H. Cole, A Short History of the British Working-Class Movement, 1789-1947 (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1948), p. 325.

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid., pp. 235, 236.

53 Ibid., p. 76.

54 A Dominie's Log, p. 88.

55 G. D. H. Cole, op. cit., p. 236.

56 Ibid., p. 236.

57 A Dominie's Log, p. 145-146.

58 Karl Miller (ed.), Memoirs of a Modern Scotland (London: Farber and Farber, 1970) pp. 151-153.

59 Ibid., p. 153.

60 In Karl Miller, op. cit., pp. 36-37.

61 Ibid., p. 54.

62 Ibid., p. 50.

63 Karl Miller, op. cit., p. 31.

64 Ibid., p. 48.

65 Ibid., p. 42.

66 See A. S. Neill, Hearts not Heads in the School (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1944).

67 Karl Miller, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

68 Roderick Kedward, The Anarchists: The Men Who Shocked an Era (New York: American Heritage Press, 1971), p. 89.

NATIONAL IDENTITY AND EDUCATION: SYMBOLS AND REALITY

by

Normand R. Bernier
Associate Professor
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Twentieth century earthlings inhabit a planet characterized by conflicts between and among national groupings. They witness the continuous struggle between political communities, nation-states, as they vie for economic, political, and military advantage in the world arena. Similarly, they are constantly harassed by a procession of crises as nation-states, rent by internal rebellion, attempt to restrain other national groups situated within their borders. In some cases these nationalities in search of cultural and/or political autonomy achieve their political independence and become nation-states and join the fracas in the international coliseum. Elsewhere, others fail in their demand for collective self-determination and suffer the tragic fate of the Biafran people. In some cases, exemplified by the disappearance of some American Indian nationalities, the horrible genocide is successful and total. (Usuallv, Indian nationalities are labelled "tribes," a pejorative term used extensively to describe non-caucasian ethnic groupings. The denigrating label often serves to linguistically set the stage for the oppression of peoples in the name of modernization.

In nation-states such as the United States and the Soviet Union where sophisticated technocracies and bland bureaucracies house tradition-oriented as well as inchoate cultural diversity, social stability is tenuous. Periodic conflicts between governmental agencies seeking efficient homogeneity and members of minority groups searching for creative and sometimes aggressive cultural autonomy alert citizens to the fact that nationalism is as much an intra-national issue as it is an inter-national one.

Regardless of the political results of the conflicts between competing nationalisms the consequences are invariably bloody and devastating. The massacre of the innocent has never been so widespread and vicious and, yet because of the popularization and proliferation of virulent and competative nationalisms, it appears that human lives will continue to be sacrificed, often willingly, upon the altars of ethnic pride and national honor. Unless one accepts a belief in the regressive evolution of the human species or adheres to a view that the human character is inherently malevolent, he must search within the human social condition for the factors which support such a tragic state of planetary affairs. It behooves researchers and scholars in all disciplines to identify such fraticidal forces which divide the human family and explore for means to obviate them. Simplistic views of nationalism which equate it with ultranationalism and place it in unavoidable conflict with internationalism must be discarded. Similarly, scholars and teachers must avoid the popular escape into pseudo-international rhetoric which often camouflages intra-national discord and intolerance. Wishful thinking about the disappearance of national groups will not solve our critical problems. Political and cultural national groupings exist and will continue to exist in the forseeable future. The issue that confronts twentieth century scholars is not the search for means to destroy national group identity but rather to discover mechanisms that will support individualism and pluralism and thus ensure peace, freedom, and creativity.

The focus of this paper is upon selected ideological elements which relate to intra-national group relations and national cohesion. It is not an historical study nor the product of such an endeavor. It is, however, an exploration by a student of ideology into the symbolic universe of individuals who perceive themselves as nationals. It is presented to provoke thought and not to prove an hypothesis.

All nation-states in their laws or in their practices reveal belief in their invincibility and indivisibility; this belief is invariably supported by most loyal citizens and propagandized by governmental agencies. The nation-state, as well as the assumptions which legitimize it, however, is sustained primarily by a sense of "peoplehood" that is shared by members of the citizenry. Schools, especially public schools, and mass media are the principle means utilized to develop and maintain such a vital collective awareness and group identity. These agencies need not be centrally controlled or coerced by political hacks to fulfill their nationalizing role. Indeed, such a function emerges naturally from the ideological and symbolic universe in which the agencies are situated and generally has been accepted without deliberation or critical thought. Recent crises generated by national self doubt, however, have placed this function into question and unleashed a plethora of inflamatory rhetoric as well as naive prophecies of national doom.

Besides schools and mass media, numerous national organizations, especially educational associations such as the National Education Association and the National History of Education Society, also serve to enhance national awareness. Although such organizations are concerned with international realities as well as regional and local issues, they primarily include nationals in their membership and "...explicitly or implicitly function to promote the development of knowledge, theoretical or applied within their own national society,"[1]

Diverse factors serve to make the nation a common point of reference for the citizenry and/or nationality, and thus function as cement to bind the identification of the self with the social group. Although "objective" factors such as race, religion, common traditions language, or shared geographic space have been forwarded by nationalists as bases of national social identity, none of these elements suffices to explain the existence of national consciousness. Deutsch accurately observed: "It is now clear why all the usual descriptions of a people in terms of a community of language, or character, or memories, or past history, are open to exception. For what counts is not the presence or absence of any single factor, but merely the presence of sufficient communication facilities with enough complementarity to produce the overall result."[2]

The national collectivity which is psychologically and socially united is created and maintained by "complimentarity" of communication. In a metaphorical sense, therefore, "language" is central to national awareness and provides a valuable tool in analyzing collective identity and behavior. A shared "language" serves to facilitate common action and reflects the perceptual framework and ideological assumptions which characterize a group of individuals who perceive themselves as a "people" rather than as an aggregate. This shared "language" furnishes individuals who do not interact directly with one another with a sense of community membership; that is, it rewards the individuals who partake of this "language" system with a communal feeling of kinship.

This shared "language" which individuals utilize who perceive themselves as a people reflects their map of social reality. It is this map or ideology which not only provides them with a system for identifying social phenomena but also gives meaning and perspective to their observations. While the map reveals the perceptual idiosyncrasies of individuals it also reflects collective assumptions about social patterns, goals, and behaviors. Since ideological maps are the result of socialization and reflect collective attitudes they not only provide individuals with selected perceptual roadways and alternatives but also function to limit as well as orient perceptual choice.

Phenomenologists have observed that individuals behave according to the ways they perceive reality and not according to the perceived reality of others or of "reality" itself. Ideological maps and the symbol systems through which they are expressed provide citizens with perceptual gyrescopes. An understanding of these maps and symbol systems can serve to clarify the complex interrelationship between social advocacies, intentions and behavior. Behavior is rooted to perception. Perception is tied to symbol systems. Symbol systems form part of the ideological constructs of reality which human beings utilize to decipher meaning and relevance.[3] All these processes and their synergistic relationship form the foundation of human social behavior.

While ideological maps serve to bind together members of social groups, they also can disrupt social stability.[4] Obviously, ideological maps that identify some individuals or groups as "enemies of the people" can easily generate war or rebellion. There are more subtle ways, however, in which ideological maps disrupt social systems. For example, an ideological map and its symbol system may be outdated or may grossly misrepresent social reality. Like the perennial tourist utilizing an outdated road map suddenly confronting a maze of new road construction, the carrier of an outdated ideological map also will experience confusion and in some cases rage. When this confusion and rage are shared by a large segment of a collectivity the social system will suffer from anomie and if a threat is perceived, whether it is rooted to an actual or imaginary situation, the danger of bloodshed will be considerable. The horror of bloody conflict will be counterbalanced and often overcome by the terror of ideological rupture and its consequential threat of psychological disintegration. The inherent danger in a grossly defective map and symbol system, rather than the ideocentrism of such systems, is the major concern of this paper. Needless to add, ideocentrism and also ethnocentrism remain as important causes of intra-national and inter-national strife.

The symbol systems which a people utilize not only reflect ideological maps but also are defined by them. Similarly, belief systems and symbol systems are interwoven and influence one another. Humpty Dumpty was wrong when he scornfully told Alice that he was master of his words. Mannheim knew better and accurately noted that the individual "...speaks the language of his group; he thinks in the manner in which his group thinks. He finds at his disposal only certain words and their meaning."[5]

The conclusion drawn from the aforementioned relationships is that an understanding of the behavior of the human traveller in the intricate network of national communities requires that an observer move beyond the analysis of social topography or demography. Similarly, observation of the behavior of the traveller and his explicit individual advocacies cannot suffice as a base for understanding his social intentions. A researcher must analyze and decipher the composition of the ideological map which the traveller utilizes. Theoretically, the analysis of this internalized map could be accomplished through sophisticated psychological testing and manipulation, however, since we are not particularly concerned with ideosyncratic internalization and since we are dealing with a shared social map which is rooted to and reflected in symbolic forms, it would appear that a more fruitful and less hazardous approach would be the analysis of shared symbol systems viewed holistically.

Social stability relates directly to the functional flexibility of ideological and symbol systems. How these systems are developed and sustained remains a mystery. Noam Chomsky wrote: "A system of knowledge and belief results from the interplay of innate mechanisms, genetically determined maturational processes, and the interaction with the social and physical environment. the problem is to account for the system constructed by the mind in the course of interaction."[6] How are ideological and symbol systems transformed? How are such transformations related to social change and technological imperatives?

Do agencies such as schools which are designed to conserve traditions and their symbolic expressions, inhibit effective and needed alterations in ideological and symbols systems? I believe that the educational historian is eminently qualified to research these critical questions and that his/her advantageous intellectual position carries with it the responsibility to do so. The educational historian not only possesses the research skills to observe and analyze ideological and symbolic shifts longitudinally but also understands the educational process which is at the core of ideological maintenance and transformation. Historical amnesia, especially in an age of rapid technological and social change, violates the call to relevance! The "now" is history and history is the "now".

The segments of the ideological and symbol systems which are especially important in nation-states characterized by pluralism are the parts which relate to national identity. Mannheim emphasized: "A Society is possible in the last analysis because the individuals in it carry around in their heads some sort of picture of that society."[7] Who are the people? Who is excluded from the community of identity? Who is Un-American? The answers to these questions rests upon the symbols of national identity. The efficacy and functional flexibility of a nation's self-image especially when pluralism prevails will determine, in part, whether a society can achieve intra-national concord and inter-national peace.

The interrelationship between symbols of national identity and national cohesion is revealed when viewing loyalty. While some symbols of national identity may encourage the expression of national loyalty others may inhibit such expression because the object of loyalty remains unclear and/or unworthy of emotional commitment. Schaar analyzed the important relationship between symbols of collective identity and individual loyalty and concluded: "The relation between the generative matrix and the specificity of a loyalty is direct; as the matrix tends toward formlessness, the loyalty becomes less specific; conversely as the matrix increases in precision of structure, the loyalty increases in specificity. The less specific the loyalty the more easily it is transferred to a greater number of situations."[8] Generally loyalty towards persons or things or anthropomorphic representations of nations will tend to be more focalized and intense than loyalties expressed towards ideals, belief systems, and institutions. In the latter cases, loyalties are usually more diffused and like the symbols of identity more abstract.

Schaar's observations are especially important because individuals are carriers of multiple loyalties which may be mutually supportive or mutually exclusive.[9] Consequently if the symbol matrix of national identity is characterized by precision, the elements which are perceived as non-national or un-national will increase. thus, for example, if the image of American national identity excludes certain ideologies, races, cultural patterns, or religions, then loyalty to these factors and national loyalty will not be mutually supportive and may serve to produce intra-national scapegoating and conflict. Parenthetically this relationship between collective identity and loyalty explains, in part, why nativism and separatism are interwoven and interdependent and why symbols of national identity may generate civil war as well as group cohesion. Patriotic symbolism may be unpatriotic!

The history of social systems determines, in part, the nature of symbol systems, and consequently the past, as well as the present social realities, play an important role in determining social issues and national stability (or instability). Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann analyzed the complexity of the identity formation process and wrote:

> The social processes involved in both the formation and maintenance of identity are determined by the social structure. Conversely, the identities produced by the interplay of organism, individual consciousness and social structure react upon the given social structure, maintaining it, modifying it, or even reshaping it. Societies have histories in the course of which specific identities emerge; these histories are, however, made by men with specific identitites.[10]

Symbol systems developed in the past will linger after the social processes which generated them. For example, slavery and its concomitant racism have produced a symbol system which continues to sustain institutional racist practices as well as bigoted attitudes. The evils of distorted collective symbols produced by one generation will be visited upon their children and their children's children!

Individual citizens do not all play an equal part in determining the collective identity of their society. Leaders in the cultural activities of a nation such as historians, ideologists, scientists, artists, politicians, educators, and mass media personalities all play an important role in national identity formation since their social definitions and symbolic representations of social realities will be popularized and disseminated through various institutional mechanisms such as national associations, schools, mass media and political agencies. Obviously the individuals who control the communication networks will play an important part in the formation of symbol systems.

While the membership of these leadership groups will vary from nation to nation, the identity of the individuals who compose this elite will affect significantly the nature of the national self-image which they will collectively generate. Charles E. Merriam focusing upon the relationship between tradition and group cohesion wrote: "Inevitably as various groups in the community stand to win or lose by emphasis on this or that tradition which may be for the moment useful to them purposes, they will endeavor to swing the weight of the influence in their direction. The unending power struggles for the domination of the whole group and its symbols make such a situation a constantly recurring fact in thy life of any growing and changing state."11

Because maps of collective beliefs and the symbolic representations of collectivities are not designed or developed by total populations but rather result from the efforts of a dominant socio-economic class, they are inherently defective. Such maps and symbols invariably reflect the "tunnel vision" which characterizes a sub-national group. This crisis of symbolism is especially acute if pluralism prevails. When the symbols of national identity result from the perceptions of a dominant culture group within a pluralistic society rather than from the creative interaction among the diverse intra-national communities (e.g. religious sects, nationalities, races), the symbol system eventually will become disfunctional. The collapse of the disfunctional system will become very rapid when the puritan expectations and demands imposed by nation-building are achieved and replaced by progressive dreams of self-fulfillment and self-expression.

When defective archaic symbol systems persist, justice cannot be achieved by institutional reform and legal changes. Attempts to change institutional patterns and legal codes do not suffice to reorient a social system undergoing a crisis of identity. History is replete with examples of crises of symbolism which excacerbated social disintergration. Political revolutions invariably reflect an overthrow, usually partial, of outdated symbols. While political revolutions often serve to uproot disfunctional ideological maps and defective symbol systems, some elements from these uprooted systems usually remain and are syncretized with emerging or imposed alterations. This syncretism may serve as a foundation for national schizophrenia. A few observations concerning this phenomenon in the emergence of the American ideology will be noted below but first a few comments about symbols and dissonance in societies characterized by pluralism.

A nation-state composed primarily of immigrants and their descendents faces a particularly complicated process of achieving national cohesion. Generally, this process in the United States is viewed through advocacies of social adjustment. While theoretical constructs of such a process are numerous, they generally are designated according to an assimilative model (anglo-conformity), an amalgamation model (the melting pot), and a maintenance model (cultural pluralism). In a thematic analysis of speeches delivered to the General Assembly of the National Education Association from 1858 to the present, I analyzed such advocacies and concluded that they do not only serve to identify conscious social ideals and intentions but also may function to camouflage the more important attitudes about national identity. Indeed, models of social adjustment often served as euphemisms in defense of the existing perceptual and symbol systems. Whether such masquerades were intentional or reflective of the majority of the cases is not the issue here--what is critical is the fact that advocates of social reform as well as advocates in defense of the status quo often reflected the acceptance of a grossly inaccurate design of national identity. Similarly, regardless of social adjustment advocacies, speakers generally separated the national citizenry into two categories; assimilators and assimilatees. The assimilators (fuzzy replicas of Englishmen) invariably were viewed as the models of American identity. My study revealed that to understand the development of national identity, researchers must go beyond advocacies and beyond simplistic content analysis and delve into the complex"language systems" utilized by social elites. My analysis also revealed that during periods of national doubt or perceived collective threat, citizens often reflect a tendency to narrow the symbolic matrix which represents their national collectivity. Obviously, this process can generate or force disloyalty. Often this narrowing of the symbolic matrix of collective identity either limited the definition of the nation to the identity of the dominant culture group, or it projected an image rooted to the acceptance of a temporary pluralism which eventually would be replaced by a type modeled from the expectations and aspirations of the dominant socio-ethnic class.

The crisis of national identity in the United States results, in part, from the complex process of national development, and illustrates the fact that the history of symbol systems moves at a different pace than the history of social advocacies or the history of social systems. The disjunction between these histories is at the root of the conflicts between and among national groups.

The process of national development in the United States differs markedly from European antecedents or current European patterns. The two major social movements which serve as a base for the emergence of European nationalisms were: (1) the establishment of a dynastic etatism, and (2) the development of cohesive cultural communities. When the processes did not emerge simultaneously and coterminously, the state with the rise of popular sovereignty, sought to create the nationality. In other cases, the nationality sought to establish its political autonomy and created the state.

American nationalism, unlike the aforementioned forms did not emerge from an existing state or from a cultural community. Rather it began as a political community, a citizenry, which was in rebellion against a state--a rebellion legitimized on the bases of universal natural laws. The American federal union emerged from the activities of the citizenry and not from the activities of a state. Similarly, the political community was not coterminous with a nationality. The dominant culture was not shared by all the members of the citizenry. Indeed, it was shared between some Americans and the citizens of a "foreign power," the "Mother Country" (a very relevant symbolic anthropomorphic expression which exemplifies the distorted view of the origins of the American people and of the United States). The expressed loyalty of many of the leaders of the rebellious dominant class during the latter part of the colonial period and during the revolution revealed a devotion to both "America" (often in the form of localism) and England.[12] This dual loyalty on the part of the individuals who generated the symbol system of the young Republic besmeared national identity. While the dual loyalty has disappeared, the symbols of national identity which were developed when such loyalties existed continue to be utilized and reflect an American political identity and a Neo-British cultural identity.

Annexation and immigration fueled the crisis of national identity because such processes were viewed as threats to national cohesion since they represented a proliferation of pluralisms and cultural formlessness. The perceived threat to national cohesion propelled anglos and anglo-conformists in the dominant class to further narrow the symbols of national identity. Rather than focusing upon the common elements of a political community, the dominant culture group leadership often generated odels of national identity that were based upon mythological cultural homogeneity.

While the symbols of national identity often reflect a divisive ethnic bias, the national creed with its ideals, justifications, dreams, legitimations, and national purpose rest upon a sound conception of political community. This often latent national political identity offers a viable alternative to develop a meaningful collective identity for the citizens of the United States. Arieli wrote: "With the spread of political democracy, the concept of the American society as a system of liberty and equality became the dominant concept of national identity."[13] He added: "The people did not give the land its name; rather the land made them a people--American."[14] Robert Frost in a remarkably similar fashion affirmed: "The land was ours before we were the lands." Their optimism is also expressed by Kohn who wrote: "Yet the American ideal of liberty--has proved a stronger national cement and a more secure basis for ordering liberty and economic prosperity than bonds of common blood or religion or the uniformity of a closed society."[15]

Unfortunately while the American creed, with its assumptions and advocacies dedicated to democratic propositions, reflects a national reality, the optimistic scholars' observations that such a political creed serves as a symbolic system for the national self-image is not accurate. Symbols of collective identity often are rooted to such divisive conceptions as "theism," "christianity," "caucasian," "European stock," " protestant," "middle class," and sundry other limiting and inaccurate terms. A viable symbol system for the United States must be based upon a collective self-image of an interdependent people reflective of cultural, religious, racial, and ideological pluralism dedicated to the proposition that the democratic ideals with the promise of liberty, equality, and fraternity can serve as a workable foundation for national development. Suffrage and diversity and not blood or ethnic identity are the foundation of American collective identity.

Scholarship as well as social responsibility demand that issues which relate to national life be researched and clarified. Such research should be painstakingly designed to avoid dominant class bias, ethnocentric and ideocentric "tunnel vision" and distorted symbolic patterns. American history is not synonymous with anglo-saxon history, nor is it bourgeois history, nor is it majority and minority history. It is the history of a people characterized by diversity and sharing a common membership in a political community. Not only does this affirmation imply that diversity exists but it also avows that the relationship between and among individuals and groups within the political community is the matter of American history. As John Dewey stated in his 1916 address to the National Education Association:

> Such terms as Irish-American or Hebrew-American or German-American are false terms because they seem to assume something which is already in existence called America, to which the other factors may be externally hitcht (sic) on. The fact is, the genuine American, the typical American is himself a hyphenated character... he is international and interracial in his makeup. He is not American plus Pole or German. But the American is himself Pole-German-English-French-Spanish-Italian-Greek-Irish-Scandinavian-Bohemian-Jew- and so on.[16]

Alterations in the socialization process must be forthcoming if we are to avoid national disintegration. What is urgently needed is to identify defective national symbols that are based upon ethnic rather than political characteristics and to seek means to obviate such distorations. Similarly, there is need to identify and teach political symbols that are consistent with the nature of the political community. While it may be a popular and much needed development to focus upon the multicultural characteristics of the citizenry, if such an emphasis retards an exploration for those communal bonds than can transcend such differences then the future of the Republic is bleak indeed. While we express rightful indignation at the fact that symbols of national identity are grossly defective and divisive, we should not loose sight of the fact that the most sacred heritage of our political community, human suffrage, is ignored and ridiculed by an increasing segment of the population. And while we praise multicultural expositions and ethnic awareness programs, we must not forget that a frightening percentage of the population does not understand the democratic ideals and are highly susceptible to inflammatory totalitarian rhetoric. And before we condemn outright those institutions designed to develop common identity and political awareness, we should seriously ask what the alternatives will offer a society that has yet to discover mechanisms for actualizing its political creed in a complex, urban, and technological civilization.

The philosopher Dubois, focusing upon the nation's past affirmed: "Little of beauty has America given the world save the rude grandeur

God himself stamped on her bosom; the human spirit in this new world has expressed itself in vigor and ingenuity rather than in beauty."[17] Perhaps it is the task of this bedazzled generation and future generations of Americans to add beauty to the vigor and ingenuity. When Americans further develop and implement the ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity so that they will enhance individuality and pluralism, then and only then will the national motto E Pluribus Unum reflect a reality rather than merely a directive. If such an Americanism is achieved, the nation's latent beauty will flourish and offer a beacon to a world which all too often unites because of shallow similarities and fights because of petty differences.

NOTES

1 Florian Znaniecki, Modern Nationalities: A Sociological Study (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1952), p. 66.

2 Karl W. Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1953), p. 97.

3 See, for example, Edmund Husserl, Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology (New York: Collier Books, 1962), and Georges Gurvitch, The Social Framework of Knowledge (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), and Hermut R. Wagner (editor), Alfred Schultz: On Phenomenology and Social Relations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).

4 See, for example, Normand R. Bernier and Jack E. Williams, Beyond Beliefs: Ideological Foundations of American Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973) and Education for Liberation: Readings from an Ideological Perspective (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973).

5 Karl Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1936), p. 3.

6 Noam Chomsky, Problems of Knowledge and Freedom (New York: Random House Inc., 1971), p. 21.

7 Mannheim, op. cit., p. xxiii.

8 John Schaar, Loyalty in America (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), p. 6.

9 See, for example, Morton Grodzins, *The Loyal and the Disloyal: Social Boundaries of Patriotism and Treason* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956).

10 Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Knowledge: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967), p. 173.

11 Charles E. Merriam, *The Making of Citizens: A Comparative Study of Methods of Civic Training* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 13.

12 See, for example, Merle E. Curti, *The Roots of American Loyalty* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946), 1946.

13 Yehoshua Arieli, Individualism and Nationalism in American Ideology (Baltimore: Penguine Books, Inc., 1966), p. 341.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

15 Hans Kohn, American Nationalism: An Interpretative Essay (New York: The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company, 1961), p. 19.

16 John Dewey, "Nationalizing Education," *Journal of Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the National Education Association of the United States, New York, New York, July 1-8, 1916* (n.p.: n.n., n.d.), pp. 184-185.

17 W.E. Dubois, The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches (New York: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1968), p. 181.

ELLA FLAGG YOUNG:
CHICAGO SCHOOL SUPTERINTENDENT – 1909-1915

by

Rosemary V. Donatelli
Associate Professor, Foundations of Education
Loyola University, Chicago

The American educational enterprise is what it is today because of the many individuals who have contributed much to give it substance, form, and color. Teachers have, of course, left their mark upon it. But so, too, have political figures, statesmen, scholars, and administrators. Not all have made improvements; some have done more harm than good. Nevertheless, on both the national and local levels, certain persons have worked vigorously to improve education in the United States. They have called attention to its weaknesses and attempted a reform of its ills.

This paper seeks to describe some of the contributions of one such person who, although a figure of national reputation and importance, achieved much of that national reputation because of her work in educational activity as she performed at the local level. That person was Ella Flagg Young (1845–1918) teacher, professor, and administrator who gave more than fifty years of dedicated effort to shaping the educational enterprise in the city of Chicago where, in fact, the public school system was often as unpredictable and filled with problems as it is today. As principal of the first"practice school" in Chicago, as student and--later--colleague of John Dewey in the University of Chicago's laboratory school, as professor at that university, as principal of the Chicago Normal School, as superintendent of schools in Chicago, first woman superintendent of schools in any large city, first woman to become president of the National Education Association, as speaker, writer, and editor--she brought an inquiring mind and spirit of reform to whatever role she was called upon to assume. More importantly, such a broad spectrum of experiences allowed her more opportunity than is given many educators to attempt an implementation of their educational ideas.

The first part of this paper will merely sketch in the general educational activities of Mrs. Young, spread out as they were over this long fifty-year period; the second part will seek to detail one of her more significant accomplishments in view of its impact on the Chicago scene: the founding of teacher's councils; that is, advisory and policy-making bodies which, it is suggested, might be considered the forerunners of today's present local school councils.

An Educational Career in Chicago

Mrs. Young lived in a society caught up in winds of social, political and economic change. Thus it will be seen that some of her ideas on educational needs changed over time--especially in view of the fact that she continued to study and absorb new ideas throughout her middle years and later life. Perhaps the very dynamic nature of Chicago with its Columbian Exposition, its bustling center of commerce, and its developing institutions, as well as its political scandals, its traction and utilities investigations, and its constantly enlarging immigrant population (accompanied by all the ills that accrue to rapid development in an expanding urban environment)--perhaps all of these played a strong role in stimulating the spirit of reform that seemed to surround her efforts. Chicago was a city of multiple concerns and Ella Flagg Young was involved in these concerns. This is not to claim that she was a direct participant in all movements for social and civic reform, but it is to affirm that she was frequently in the forefront of those working for reform in education--a reform which occupied her most actively throughout her years as teacher and administrator.

Although she was born in Boston in 1845, her public career was centered in Chicago. Here her parents had decided to settle when she was six years old; and here in 1862, after a somewhat halting educational beginning because of early frequent illnesses, Miss N. Ella Flagg accepted her first teaching assignment in the Chicago public schools at the age of seventeen. It was an assignment to teach kindergarten in the old Scammon school located adjacent to the Chicago High School which she herself had attended. In 1865 Superintendent Josiah Pickard asked her to serve as the first "training teacher" of Chicago's new School of Practice. In his annual report Pickard remarked on that "experiment . . . (which) proved more than successful, and (on) the wisdom of the Board in the selection of Miss N. Ella Flagg (Young) the Training Teacher."[1]

Following upon this experience Ella Flagg Young[2] became a principal in Chicago's fast-growing system of schools. From 1887-1899 she served as an assistant superintendent of schools, resigning in the heat of controversy over the dictatorial "one-man rule" of Superintendent E. Benjamin Andrews, but not before she had submitted a plan for the organization of Chicago's teachers and administrators into a system of school councils which, in subsequent years, she declared to be a viable tool for securing needed changes in the schools.

Following her resignation in 1899, Mrs. Young enrolled for full-time study at the University of Chicago; under the direction of John Dewey, she completed her course work and wrote her doctoral dissertation, Isolation in the School, which was published in 1900.[3] The dissertation contains the nucleus of her views on teachers' councils and serves, therefore, as the chief rationale underlying their organization.

Mrs. Young was appointed to the University of Chicago as a full professor of education shortly after writing her dissertation. Here she taught along with Dewey and his faculty in the Department of

Psychology, Philosophy and Pedagogy, and in the laboratory school where she served in a number of liaison capacities among Dewey, his teachers, the parents' association of the laboratory school, and university administrators. Additionally, Mrs. Young also assumed the position of supervisor of instruction in Dewey's laboratory school.[4]

Of her work, and their association, during these years at Chicago, Dewey himself said:

> I was constantly getting ideas from her. In the reorganization of the laboratory school after certain weaknesses in its original scheme of administration had become apparent (due largely to my inexperience in administrative matters) her influence together with that of Mrs. Dewey were the controlling factors. It is due to these two that the laboratory school ran so much more systematically and definitely--free from a certain looseness of ends and edges--in its last three or four years.[5]

Continuing in this vein, Dewey added:

> Apart from the suggestions which were so numerous that I couldn't name them, what I chiefly got from Mrs. Young was just the translation of philosophic conceptions into their empirical equivalents. More times than I could well say I didn't see the meaning or the force of some favorite conception of my own till Mrs. Young gave it back to me. . . . I think what Mrs. Young got from her philosophic courses was an intellectual, systematized justification of her practical and experimental belief in. . . the intellectual procedures of the pupil as a person. I have to confess that I never appreciated that aspect of my own logical theory till I found it so emphasized by her. Putting it in another way, it was from her that I learned that freedom and respect for freedom meant regard for the inquiring and reflective process of individuals, and that what ordinarily passes for freedom--freedom from external restraint, spontaneity in expression, etc., are of significance only in their connection with thinking operations.[6]

Ella Flagg Young left the University of Chicago after the Spring Quarter of 1904, not long after John Dewey and several of the laboratory school faculty had severed their relationship with that institution.

In 1905, after a trip spent in examining European's schools, Mrs. Young again resumed her professional career. She accepted the position of principal at the Chicago Normal School--a spot vacated by the death of Arnold Tompkins. In this role her desire to improve teacher education had some chance of gratification--but only partially--for, like her predecessor, Tompkins, Mrs. Young found that trying to change "ideals in education from the [condition of] static to dynamic" was an attempt which the Chicago Board of Education did not or was not always able to understand or support.[7] Nevertheless, her four years spent in this position were witness to changes consonant with the demands she felt were being made by the schools. Moreover, these years served as a valuable training ground for the office of Superintendent of Schools--the office to which she was elected in 1909.

It was in this last role--that of Superintendent--that Mrs. Young was said to have "coordinated activities to a high degree of efficiency"[8] and to have demonstrated imagination and courage in the management and operation of her office. Later, in this same position, she was accused of not cooperating with the Chicago Board of Education, whereupon she finally resigned amid much controversy, and after several bitter fights in which the Chicago Teachers' Federation played an active role in trying to retain her.

Yet, on the whole, Mrs. Young's years as superintendent of Chicago's schools were relatively calm; she succeeded, shortly after taking office, in bringing some measure of peace to the city's system and in winning general approval for her administrative policies.[9] During these years she helped stimulate curriculum reorganization and earnestly tried to establish a more personal relationship with her teachers--a relationship which had seriously deteriorated under the leadership of her predecessor, Edwin G. Cooley.

When she finally resigned her position as superintendent in December of 1915, she had completed more than fifty years of teaching and administrative work. She had fostered the expansion of school facilities so that the public schools might handle the constantly expanding pupil population; she had participated in efforts to secure the best teachers possible under the most trying of circumstances--opposition to the cost of a long-range teacher education program at the Chicago Normal School; she had successfully fought some of the opponents of curriculum reform while holding to the right of dissent whenever, in her opinion, advocates of such reform moved too swiftly; she helped establish two years of vocational work in the high schools and also helped structure a two-year commercial course; she fostered the growth of kindergartens by both professional activity and private money; and she inaugurated a controversial sex education program in selected Chicago public schools. Above all she stood firm on certain principles which she felt represented democratic administration of the teacher's councils.

When she died in 1918 after being stricken with influenza while on a nation-wide speaking tour for the Liberty Loan Fund, her death was a shock to many whose lives she had touched. Even those who opposed her administration of the Chicago schools recognized her as a superior opponent. Perhaps the words of Jane Addams summarize more accurately than any others the impression made by Ella Flagg Young. When informed of Mrs. Young's death, Miss Addams said quite simply:

"She had more general intelligence and character than any other woman I knew."[10]

Democratic Administration on the Local Level: Teacher's Councils

Of all the efforts made by Mrs. Young to change the schools so as to bring them in line with a changing society, the one which captured the imagination and involvement of most teachers, and made the strongest impact on the administrative and teaching staff, was the organization of Chicago's teachers and administrators into groups known as teachers' councils. These first came into being sometime between the years 1898-1899, although at that time, Mrs. Young's attempts to gain official recognition and authorization of power for these councils failed. In those years she was an assistant superintendent of schools and involved with Superintendent E. Benjamin Andrews in a controversy over administrative operations. During this period the Chicago Board of Education merely gave tacit approval to the councils by appropriating a sum of money for publicity expenses of the Central Council.[11] However, even this appropriation died when Mrs. Young resigned, and the councils lay dormant during Mrs. Young's years at the University of Chicago and at the Chicago Normal School.

The plan for the structure of these councils does not appear to have been explicitly detailed in any document issued by the Chicago Board of Education during the time when the councils were first formed. However, in 1913, when Mrs. Young reactivated the councils, as Superintendent of Schools, her message to the Board of Education suggested that the councils would be structured along lines she had set down in 1899.[12] The refinements and justification of that structure were, by 1913, a matter of published fact, explicitly stated in her doctoral dissertation, Isolation in the School. In that dissertation which later became known as the "bible" of Chicago public school teachers, Mrs. Young asserted:

> There must come a recognition of the law of life in . . . schools. The school cannot take up the question of the development of training for citizenship in a democracy while the teachers are still segregated in two classes. . . .[13]

What was needed was an organization in which teachers could meet freely without fear of administrative reprisals in order to consider questions of "legislation." Mrs. Young explained.:

> The voice of authority of position not only must not dominate, but must not be heard in the councils. . . . And they must be so organized that they are small enough to make discussions deliberative, not sensational.[14]

In essence, the organization proposed was to have a Central or General Council made up of delegates from the various district councils which in turn were to be composed of delegates from each local school council. In local meetings, matters of concern would be taken up by the delegates to the appropriate district and then to the General Council.

From the General Council recommendations would then go to the Superintendent of Schools who would, according to the details of the plan, sit down with assistant or district superintendents to discuss the recommendations and suggest ways to implement these. If there were points of difference or judgment, then the district superintendents would meet once again with the district councils to see if the problem might not be adjudicated. If the matter were serious enough it might pass down to the local school councils once again. And according to Mrs. Young:

> If the result of the second discussion shows the original recommendation by the council again sustained, . . . the superintendent . . . should act in accordance with his own judgment, and be held responsible for the outcome.[15]

According to this plan, at least all the teachers would be aware of the debate; no one would receive the superintendent's decision without having been informed about the issues. And even though his decision might be an unfavorable one from the teacher's point of view, the deliberations would have familiarized all with the essentials involved so that the process of education would be a continuous one, "based on theoretical structure, not mere experimentation based on personal preference."[16]

This, then, was Mrs. Young's vision of a professional, informed group of teachers organized for deliberate, rational discussion, capable of suggesting policy and contributing to her concept of a democratic process for school administration. This was her model for effecting cooperative change in the schools; and, actually, it appears to have been very much in the forefront of her mind, even in 1900, when she framed the thesis of their dissertation which states:

> The level of power in the educational system is determined by the degree to which the principle of cooperation is made incarnate in developing and realizing the aim of the school.[17]

It would appear that the teachers' councils were to be the operational machinery which Mrs. Young reasoned might best achieve a high degree of cooperation and that such machinery would function as the medium by which change might be made in the schools so that the schools would no longer remain (as she described them) "isolated from life."

On March 20, 1913 the plan proposed by Mrs. Young some fourteen years prior was adopted by the Chicago Board of Education.[18] Its full structure is set down in her report to the board for that year.[19] Among the more significant provisions is one stipulating separate organizations for classroom teachers and another for administrative officials. The plan provided a total of seventy-four councils of which sixty were apportioned among the entire teaching body of the Chicago public schools and fourteen were apportioned among the various administrators. Each local council adopted its own procedural policy, initiated its own subjects for discussion, and tried to give full expression or voice to the different attitudes and judgments of the teaching force.[20]

In evaluating the work of the councils during their first year of operation, Mrs. Young noted that the major emphasis has been focused on revising the course of study in both outline and specific detail. She also noted that although "needed adjustments were apparent," much had been accomplished by the councils and the results were satisfactory. Actually, the important school survey of 1914 had been planned, organized, and carried out by the councils.

By 1913, Mrs. Young had faced a number of administrative crises and had tendered a resignation which the board refused to accept because of a public outcry of protesting its treatment of Mrs. Young. One widely-publicized mass meeting held by Chicago teachers at the Auditorium Theatre in Chicago was an especially trying experience for board members. (A transcript of that meeting[21] suggests that it was every bit as fiery as the famed Boston convention of the National Education Association which had elected Mrs. Young as its first president in 1909.) The result was Mrs. Young's triumphal return to office.

After she resumed the superintendency, Mrs. Young's last eighteen months in office were marked by repeated clashes with the board; and, although the councils met and functioned smoothly, she finally submitted another resignation in 1915. This time Mrs. Young stepped down permanently from Chicago's educational scene.

The history of the councils after Mrs. Young's departure is a story of peaks and valleys. Successively, Superintendents John D. Shoop and Charles E. Chadsey did little to stimulate council activity; nor did they even convene the councils as they were empowered to do.[22]

When Peter Mortenson took office in 1919, the fortunes of the councils took an upward swing. Mortenson appears to have had no difficulty in persuading the board to assist in a revival of the councils. Council documents indicate that he used exactly the same structural plan as that set up by Mrs. Young.[23] Meetings were held regularly and the councils appear to have thrived during his administration.

However, with the arrival of Superintendent William McAndrew in 1924, the councils encountered an educator who, according to one interpretation, was "jealous of the prerogatives of his office and trained in a contrary tradition."[24] Apparently McAndrew felt that his own authority was severely limited by the councils' deliberations, and so moved against the councils, first by ignoring their usual meeting time and then by carrying on various legal and technical maneuvers which resulted in a six-month contest between McAndrew and council representatives. Finally, the end came when the Chicago Board of Education gave McAndrew the authority he had requested in the form of an amendment to revise board rules with respect to the councils. This time the superintendent was empowered to decide when the councils should be called. Once that power was granted, McAndrew had only to refrain from ever calling the councils since they were to be called at his discretion instead of at times previously prescribed. Thus, in effect, the councils were abolished. McAndrew never called them again.[25]

Today, although the councils do not function formally as teachers' councils, the concept of local councils operating as vehicles for potential policy-making still persists. Based on a plan adopted under Superintendent James Redmond in 1969, another type of local council has been inaugurated. This plan calls for teacher representatives from each Chicago Public School to meet in councils, together with parents, and other "interested participants of the community," for the purpose of dealing with school policy issues. These councils, then, have a much broader base than the councils organized by Ella Flagg Young. Yet, they have a similar structure and purpose. They are bodies gathered together for rational deliberation of educational matters so that (in Mrs. Young's words) "theoretical structures rather than personal preferences" may be the basis for initiating cooperative educational change.

While these local councils have not yet existed over a period of time long enough to evaluate their viability, the impression conveyed suggests that they may prove valuable in facilitating needed change in the Chicago schools. It is true that some local councils in Chicago have been accused of self-interest, of stimulating community discontent, and of outright rabble-rousing. But this has happened in other places as well. The celebrated case of Ocean Hill-Brownsville and the New York Teachers Union is, of course, a good illustration of a community council concept badly carried out.

Yet, as a contrary example, although it is still too early to determine the probable outcome of Chicago's Gage Park High School controversy (a controversy which appears to be stimulated by factors partially racial, partially ethnic, partially numerical, and possibly political), the local Gage-Park School-Community Council meeting together with members of the Chicago Board of Education has managed to achieve a degree of detente which has enabled the education of Gage Park's students to proceed without the costly interruptions which characterized the first days of that controversy.[26]

It has been argued that teachers in this Gage Park council and in other local community councils should be dominant and should serve as agents of cooperative effort whether as members of solely advisory or policy-making bodies.[27]

Drawing upon evidence taken from the activity and writing of Ella

Flagg Young, it seems safe to suggest that she might very well have approved of this position and of the cooperative efforts of such councils, for her own view of effective school administration rested on a base of cooperative effort among all concerned with the operation of the schools. On the other hand, while it seems unlikely from the numerous examples of Mrs. Young's own readiness to meet with lay persons that she would wish to deny them a vote on local councils, it does seem necessary to point out that she would still place the chief responsibility for educational policy-making squarely on the shoulders of teachers rather than on the lay community since she herself stated so firmly on so many occasions that the professional preparation and experiences of these educators made them the very heart of the councils and identified them as among the most important factors in any local council's power to initiate cooperative educational change in the schools.

NOTES

1 *Twelfth Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education* (1866), pp. 76-77.

2 Before her first principalship Mrs. Young had married a businessman, George Young, in 1868. However, her husband died a year later somewhere in the southwest where he had gone because of poor health. Mrs. Young never spoke of this marriage nor did any of her closest friends who might have revealed something about her feelings at this time.

3 Ella Flagg Young, *Isolation in the School* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900).

4 Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards, *The Dewey School* (New York: Appleton Century Co., 1936), p. 9. Interestingly, Mrs. Mayhew who, with her sister Mrs. Edwards, was a teacher in the laboratory school with Mrs. Young, also observed Mrs. Young in another role: Mrs. Young served as Mrs. Mayhew's own instructor at the University of Chicago in the course, "Educational Outlines," Philosophy I, 81. See the Instructors' Reports, Autumn, 1903 (University of Chicago, Archives).

5 John Dewey is quoted in John T. McManis, "Ella Flagg Young and a Half-Century of the Chicago Public Schools" (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co., 1916), p. 120.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 121.

7 As one illustration, Mrs. Young's attempt to modify the Normal School course of study met with strong opposition from several members of the Chicago Board of Education. An account of that opposition is detailed in her report to Superintendent Edwin Cooley published with the Fifty-Third Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education (1907), pp. 124-141.

8 Charles H. Judd, "Ella Flagg Young," Dictionary of American Biography, XX (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1936), pp. 626-627.

9 A local newspaper felt prompted to congratulate Mrs. Young on her ability to give "effective leadership in a quiet way that wins support and disarms hostility." Chicago Tribune, October 22, 1909, p. 10.

10 See the "Necrology," of the Proceedings and Address of the National Education Association (Washington, D.C.: The Association, 1918), p. 685.

11 Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education (1898), p. 472.

12 Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education (1913), p. 931.

13 Young, *Isolation in the School*, p. 54.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 55.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 56.

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Ibid.*

18 Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education (1913), p. 980.

19 Fifty-Ninth Annual Report of the Chicago Board of Education (1913).

20 *Ibid.*

21 "Report of the Public Mass Meeting Held at the Auditorium Theater, Chicago, Saturday Morning, December 13, 1913." Files of the Chicago Teachers Federation, Chicago Historical Society. (mimeographed)

22 George S. Counts claims that the superintendents were "not interested" in calling the councils, but offers no explanation for this lack of interest. See his School and Society in Chicago (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1928), p. 113.

23 See the *Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education* (1922), p. 62; and, also the Rules and By-Laws of the Chicago Elementary Teachers' Councils published with Report of the Elementary Teachers' General Council, (Chicago: The Council 1925?), p. 3.

24 Counts, School and Society in Chicago, p. 115.

25 Proceedings of the Chicago Board of Education (1925). For McAndrew's judgment that the councils were disruptive because they were held during school hours and were "an anomaly in educational procedures" because they excluded principals, see his "Report on Teacher's Councils Presented to the Committee on Rules and the Committee on School Administration of the Board of Education of Chicago," Elementary School Journal, XXV (October, 1924), pp. 94-101.

26 Dr. John Hahn, Principal of Gage Park High School identified the period of controversy as extending from September, 1972 through February, 1973 with the most crucial week being from November 13 - November 17, 1972, a week during which school disorder and police action were at their height.

27 This is the view of two faculty members serving on the Gage-Park Council who requested anonymity (files of the author).

THE FOUNDING OF THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION: A LEGISLATIVE HISTORY*

by

Donald R. Warren
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

*A paper delivered at the first meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society in the spring of 1966. It was subsequently revised for inclusion in **To Enforce Education: A History of the Founding Years of the U.S. Office of Education** (Wayne State University Press, 1974) and is published here with the permission of the Press.

The relation of the federal government to the educational systems of the various states has been debated among the American people throughout their history. The recurring dominant position has favored private or local and state control of education, allowing however certain forms of federal aid and assistance. Historically, the position is understandable. American education began as a local and state endeavor, a series of public and private institutions, reflecting generally the values, aspirations, and ideologies of parents, their neighbors, ecclesiastical leaders, local elites, and, in some cases, professional educators.

Nevertheless, federal aid to education with its implication of centralized control is currently a point of major disagreement among various groups and individuals within the nation. Problems of urban education; discovery of the culturally deprived child; the unemployed and unemployable high school dropout; the inability of the property tax in both urban and rural areas to finance local school systems; the growing necessity of certain national goals in the training and development of human skills and resources; the debilitating effects of racism and poverty on the nation's economy and the morale of the people--all these have led to a sharpened awareness of the nation's stake in education and have conspired to raise anew the old question of the federal role in education. One hundred years ago, in the aftermath of the Civil War, essentially the same question was making the rounds. A result of the ensuing discussion was the creation of the Department of Education; another was the refusal of Congress to grant it much power.[1]

The story surrounding the founding of the Office of Education on March 2, 1867, did not begin on that date, just as federal interest in the nation's schools did not begin then. From the late 1830s until the outbreak of the Civil War, an increasing number of educators advocated the creation of a national bureau of education to collect and disseminate school statistics. According to Edgar B. Wesley in a history of the National Education Association, the National Teachers' Association from its first meeting in 1857 approved resolutions urging

Congress "to establish a national agency for collecting and disseminating educational statistics."[2] The petitions attracted little attention in the Capitol and, in truth, school people remained ambivalent about bureau plans until the outbreak of war in 1861. Opponents feared that the bureau would be a first step toward federal control of public education. Supporters, on the other hand, viewed the projected agency as a necessary device for promoting educational reform. Its data gathering activities would make knowledge about school conditions more available and serve to shame recalcitrant communities and states into increasing their support for public education.

By 1864, the bureau plan was becoming more attractive to school people. It also became the object of increasingly inflated expectations about its effectiveness in school reform. At the annual meeting of the National Teachers' Association, S.H. White of Illinois suggested that the agency's major function would be to "more fully insure the existence, prosperity and perpetuity of our institutions."[3] It would work to improve schools in certain backward states and to establish school systems in states without them. However, the important reason for establishing the bureau, according to White, followed from "a duty devolving upon the general government, for its own welfare, to see to it that the most efficient system and one suited to the spirit of republican institutions, is adopted."[4]

The National Teachers' Association met next in August, 1865 and again adopted a resolution calling for a national bureau of education. The petition noted not only the importance of collecting and disseminating educational statistics, but also "the necessity of having in every State a system of public schools for all classes, in order to [guarantee] the perpetuity and right working of our political system." It noted also "the wish and the hope that the General Government will do whatever it can rightfully and properly towards inducing the establishment of such a system of common schools in those states where they do not exist."[5]

Delegates to the meeting heard two papers dealing with federal responsibility for education. James P. Wickersham of Pennsylvania, newly elected N.T.A. President, discussed the role of education in reconstruction. He noted the low level of literacy in the South, the right of the former slaves to an education, and the need to instill within all the people of the South a love for republican virtues and respect for the United States Constitution. The war, he said, was caused by lack of education among the masses of the South and wrong education among the aristocratic slave holders. Wickersham advocated federal intervention for meeting those educational needs and correcting the errors of southern education.[6]

Andrew J. Rickoff of Ohio spoke directly to the question of creating a national bureau of Education.[7] He repeated the arguments of S.H. White and proposed the appointment of state committees to lobby for a federal department of Education. The Association adopted the proposal and by December, 1865, ten state committees had been appointed.[8] Also at the 1865 meeting, several of the delegates decided to organize a National Association of School Superintendents. They called their first meeting for February, 1866, and elected to gather in Washington for the express purpose of pressuring Congress to create a national bureau of education.[9]

Before the meeting occurred, however, the Thirty-ninth Congress convened. On December 14, 1865, shortly after the House of Representatives had completed its organizational procedures, Ignatius Donnelly, a Republican from Minnesota, introduced a resolution urging the establishment of a bureau of education. Noting that republican institutions required the universal intelligence of the people and that great disasters, such as the recent war, were traceable to the absence of common schools, the resolution called upon the Joint Committee on Reconstruction to:

> *inquire into the expediency of establishing in the Capital a national Bureau of Education, whose duty it shall be to enforce education, without regard to race or color, upon the population of all such states as shall fall below a standard to be established by Congress; and to inquire whether such a bureau should not be made an essential and permanent part of any system of reconstruction.*[10]

Philip Johnson, a Democrat from New Jersey, attempted to have the resolution tabled, but the House defeated his motion by a vote of 37 to 113, with 32 either absent or not voting. The resolution won approval without debate or recorded vote.

Two months later, the National Association of School Superintendents met in Washington. Emerson E. White, Commissioner of Common Schools of Ohio, outlined the probable accomplishments of a national bureau of education, noting that its main duty would involve collecting and diffusing school statistics. He concluded by reminding his audience of "a fundamental law, running through the entire history of educational progress, which must not be overlooked."[11] The law of "external pressure," insisted White, warns that the impulse to educational progress always comes from without and above:

> *An ignorant community has no inward impulse to lead it to educate itself.... The demand for education is always awakened by external influences and agencies.... A National Bureau would hold up to many school systems a mirror which would reveal attainable results and desirable changes.... It would be felt throughout the country.*[12]

Following White's address, the Association approved a resolution urging Congress to establish a bureau of education. The petition described the benefits to the nation and to the states of collecting and disseminating comparative school statistics. It noted that Congress possessed no official information on the manner in which the lands granted to the states for the promotion of general and specific education had been managed and that a national bureau of education could fill the void. It affirmed the system of local and state control of schools and asserted that the true function of the bureau would be to cooperate with and assist the states in the work of establishing and maintaining systems of public instruction. The resolution was adopted on February 10, 1866. A committee composed of Newton Bateman, Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction, J.S. Adams, Secretary of the Vermont Board of Education, and E.E. White was appointed to present the resolution to Congress along with a bill calling for the creation of a bureau of education in the Department of the Interior. (White later identified himself as the bill's author.) On February 14, 1866, James A. Garfield, at the time a second-term Republican congressman from Ohio, presented the memorial and bill in the House of Representatives.[13] The bill was passed through its first and second readings and referred to a select committee.[14] The report of this committee on April 3, 1866, set the stage for the congressional debate which followed.

It is a mistake to conclude from the foregoing that somewhere during the period of the Civil War the original idea of a national bureau of education was suddenly transformed into a plan for more direct federal action in the field of education. None of the antebellum proponents of the idea envisioned a passive federal agency. However, the rupture in national life and consciousness which the war caused, the quantity of illiteracy throughout the nation which it revealed, especially among poor whites and the former slaves, and the desolation of educational institutions in the South created a definite, if not self-righteous, air of emergency among the nation's leading educators. If their original outlines of the duties of a national bureau did not radically change, they at least moved closer to the heart of schoolmen's answers to the nation's postwar woes. And the reform expectations which they attached to the bureau proposal became more specific, although not less fantastic.[15]

It is unlikely that many educators were prepared for the bill which Garfield's select committee reported to the House on April 3, 1866. Presented in the form of a substitute amendment, the measure called for the creation of an autonomous, sub-cabinet level Department of Education. The substitute bill was accepted without debate and placed on the agenda as H.R. 276. It contained four sections.[16] The first called for the establishment of a Department of Education to collect statistics showing the condition and progress of education in the states and territories, diffuse such information respecting the schools which would aid the people in establishing and maintaining efficient school systems, and, finally, "otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country." Section two provided for the appointment of a Commissioner of Education by the President, set his annual salary at

$5,000, and empowered him to appoint a staff of five clerks. Section three outlined the Commissioner's duties. He was to present an annual report to Congress showing the results of his investigations, summarizing the statistics which had been collected, and recommending educational reforms. His first report was to include a statement on the land grants made by Congress to promote education, showing how the trusts had been managed, the amount of funds raised by them, and, as far as possible, their annual proceeds. Section four directed the Commissioner of Public Buildings to furnish offices for the new Department.

The debate began in the House on June 5, 1866, resuming three days later, when the first votes were taken. Ignatius Donnelly, the initial speaker, established not only the tone of the debate but also the major point of disagreement.[17] He saw conditions in the South as the main argument for the bill's passage. The southern white man needed education to the end that he would come to love the nation and the flag, and the black man required it in order to be "truly" free. In fact, Donnelly continued, the whole country needed education so that all the people might "rise together to the level of the most favored localities." He reminded the House that other major nations, including France and Prussia, had made education an affair of the central government and that in France outstanding men, such as Guizot and Cousin, had been enlisted to promote school improvement. In the United States, however, no representative of education was to be found in the nation's capital. He dismissed the states' rights argument against a central educational agency by pointing to the recent rebellion as a consequence of that kind of thinking. The war, he said, was the result of school policies initiated by Virginia's Governor Berkeley in 1671 and continued until the present day. These policies, which denied the value of popular education, had resulted in general ignorance, poverty, oppression, slavery, and, finally, anarchy. In the North, on the other hand, the tradition of the common school, begun by Massachusetts in 1642, had led to general intelligence, enterprise, prosperity, liberty, and justice.

Although his sense of history was unnecessarily biased, Donnelly's point remained unmistakable: the quality of American life and the destiny of the Union were inextricably bound with the general diffusion of knowledge. It was an old Jeffersonian idea given fresh urgency by the spiritual and material havoc left by the Civil War. Driving the point home, Donnelly observed that no section of the country could rest satisfied, since illiteracy was not restricted to the South. To eliminate error, wrong, and injustice, he concluded, there must be educational advance. Passing this bill would be a first step in that direction. The new Department would give education a national "spokesman." It could not coerce states to establish and improve their schools, but with the facts it collected it could illuminate the dark places of ignorance. It could mobilize public sentiment for education and therefore indirectly achieve an improved moral climate throughout the nation and a greater public demand for enlightened newspapers, libraries, railroads, improved machinery for agriculture, and increased comforts for the home. Individuals, families, communities, businesses, and the nation as a whole would be enriched by the work of this Department as it collected the results of educational experience and experimentation and spread them throughout the land. Finally, the Department would be a foundation for future school reform ventures.

With characteristic eloquence, Donnelly thus presented in Congress the rationale for national education which had been developed by common school leaders and which he had probably learned at the feet of John Hart, his former teacher at Philadelphia's old Central High School. His passionate commingling of idealism and radical principles placed him at odds with many of his Republican colleagues. Even his acknowledged leader, Thaddeus Stevens, who affirmed the value of education, would later reject the Minnesotan's thesis that education was the single key to southern reconstruction and social reform in general.

Some of the later spokesmen for the bill attempted to interpret or soften what Donnelly had said; others echoed his speech in tone, if not in content. For the opponents, on the other hand, the point around which their arguments were to revolve had been clarified. Now, every states' rights man in the House was forewarned as to the issue being debated. No doubt Donnelly's speech, with its overheated rhetoric, was politically and strategically unwise, but it revealed rather unambiguously the consequences which at least some supporters of the bill anticipated from its passage.

Following Donnelly's speech, Samuel Randall offered a substitute amendment to establish a Bureau of Education under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior.[18] In Randall's Plan, the Secretary was to appoint two clerks to perform the duties outlined in the original bill and, using the data they collected, construct the proposed annual report to Congress. The amendment eliminated the need for a Commissioner of Education. Randall had been a member of Garfield's committee but insisted he had not participated in its deliberations. Nettled by Donnelly's speech, he offered his amendment primarily as a reaction to the young radical's high flown phrases. Still, his proposal offered the House an alternative way of collecting and disseminating educational statistics, if that was all it desired to do.

Democrat Andrew Rogers of New Jersey opposed the bill on three counts. It represented an unnecessary expense; it was unconstitutional; and it threatened to disrupt the present effective system of local school control. Admitting confusion over Donnelly's speech, Rogers observed that the bill in its present form could not accomplish the aims Donnelly had expressed, because it proposed only to collect and diffuse facts. Since everyone knew the War was started by the educated people of the South, he persisted, how could one claim for education the glorious consequences outlined by Donnelly? The first task, according to Rogers, was to get the South back into the Union, not antagonize it with proposals for more central agencies. Finally, Rogers was piqued that a commissioner whose only job was to collect school statistics was to receive a salary which exceeded that of a congressman by $2,000. Congress has been concerned with economizing, Rogers concluded, and yet now it seemed intent upon creating a new bureau which could eventually rival the Freedmen's Bureau in power and scope of operation.

Samual Moulton, who supported the bill, attempted to answer Rogers' three points. Denying that the New Department was an unnecessary expense, he pointed to the need for school statistics on a national scale and to the limited staff allowed the Commissioner for his work. The bill was constitutional, he insisted, on the same grounds that the other departments of the Executive branch were constitutional, namely, the clause empowering Congress to enact laws necessary for the general welfare. While affirming the effectiveness of the state school systems which existed, Moulton suggested that they needed help and encouragement. Not a new idea at all, the plan for an education department had originated not in Washington, but among the nation's educators, men who themselves served as state school superintendents and who saw in the bill a way to improve the school systems which they served. Despite Rogers' remark that educated southern leaders had started the War, Moulton argued, Donnelly's point remained valid. If the masses of southern white men had been educated, they could not have been so easily led into rebellion. Education was a natural right of every child, he concluded, that ought not be left to the caprice of individuals or states.

Nathaniel Banks viewed the proposed Department as an experiment, the continuation of which depended upon annual appropriations. Since the Commissioner and clerks of the new Department were given no executive power, the bill could not centralize education. Whether the Department should be continued or strengthened were questions which only Congress could answer in subsequent sessions.

Frederick Pike of Maine, the only Republican to oppose the bill on the House floor, was not satisfied with any of the proponents' arguments. First, the question of finances bothered him. Providing offices for the new Department could lead to a major expense, particularly if new buildings had to be constructed. Pike, who had supported the bill to establish the Department of Agriculture, indicated his willingness to see a bureau of educational statistics attached to that agency, but a Department of Education was too much for him. How were the school statistics to be secured, he asked. Was the Department to use the reports already compiled by local and state superintendents or was it to send agents into the various states to collect original statistics? If the latter were planned, the bill intended to interfere directly with the work of the states. It will be a sad day, he concluded, when education is centralized because the next step will be the centralization of churches.

Samuel Randall indicated his willingness to support the bill, if his amendment were adopted. He recognized the need for collecting educational statistics but could not understand why a separate Department was necessary to perform the task. Two clerks working under the Secretary of the Interior could do the work outlined in the bill. It seemed to Randall that some of the proponents wanted something they had not requested explicitly. The bill as presented did not propose to educate anyone. Furthermore, the projected Department could not be the head of an educational system, because there was no national educational system. There were only thirty-six systems, and these rightfully must never be made one. As for education in the South, the Freedman's Bureau had been established expressly to meet this need. Surely, he said, this was enough centralization.

Claiming that his position was endorsed by educational experts throughout the nation, Randall read from a statement by Frederick A. Packard voicing opposition to the pending bill. Formerly a representative of the American Sunday School Union, Packard in the late 1830s had engaged in a bitter dispute with Horace Mann over the latter's refusal to introduce textbooks with a decided Calvinistic flavor into the common schools of Massachusetts.[19] In 1866 Packard published a book, The Daily Public School in the United States, in which he surveyed the common schools of Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.[20] Finding the schools in a "deplorable" condition, he recommended that the states stop expanding their systems to include high schools and normal schools and, instead, concentrate their efforts on the elementary level where local support could be more effectively enlisted.[21] A wider diffusion of literacy and a marked improvement in the quality of the schools would result from such a program. These outcomes would be guaranteed, according to Packard, by the involvement and enthusiasm of local groups of citizens as they exercised control over their own school.

Randall's reference to educational experts may have been an attempt to make his amendment more palatable. The Pennsylvania Democrat was doubtless aware that Republicans were far from unanimous in their support for the bill, but he was shrewd enough to know that on a final vote party loyalty could influence some to vote contrary to their individual predilections. Outnumbered by the Republicans almost four to one, Democrats in the Thirty-ninth Congress could not hope to defeat the measure alone. Long an advocate of retrenchment, Randall was probably searching for a substitute plan which might satisfy the educational enthusiasts and at the same time keep Congress from establishing a new federal agency.[22]

Following Randall's speech were three others supporting the bill. One of these, by George Boutwell, simply reviewed the points already made in favor of the bill. Josiah Grinnell, an Iowa Republican, moved to amend the measure by lowering the Commisioner's salary to $4,000 and reducing to three the number of clerks allowed in the Department. James Garfield delivered the final speech in the House debate.

Garfield's statement was significant not because it presented new arguments in favor of the bill (it did not), but because it relied heavily on school data for documentation, thus illustrating the power of educational statistics. In addition, it offered a clear and systematic discussion of the anticipated achievements of the proposed Department. Reviewing the relevant school data he found in the 1860 census, Garfield noted that as of that year there were throughout the nation over 115,000 common schools, approximately 500,000 school officers and administrators, 150,000 teachers, and five million students. He reminded the House that more than 53 million acres of public lands had been given by Congress to fourteen states and territories for the support of education and to date $50 million had been contributed by private individuals to educational endeavors. Given this financial investment in education and the six million people involved in the work of schools, it was shocking that there were only "tolerable" school statistics from seventeen states filed in the congressional library and nothing at all from the other nineteen. In light of the War, he observed, school conditions were presumably better in most states in 1860 than in 1866.

Despite the many uneducated people in the country, the real danger, according to Garfield, was not "stolid ignorance," since eventually schools would be available to children in all the states. The more important questions concerned the quality of education, and whether citizens would be directed toward industry, liberty, and patriotism. Garfield reviewed Thaddeus Stevens' 1835 speech before the Pennsylvania legislature, which documented the role of education in a republic, and with additional references to John Stuart Mill and Chancellor Kent, among others, urged his colleagues not to expect the ignorant to clamor for learning. The federal government must find a way to encourage the states to take notice of their schools. Observing the recent expenditures for an astronomical observatory, a coast survey, a railroad survey, the establishment of a patent office, and agricultural promotion, Garfield wondered why the federal government should not also express its concern for schools. Finally, he reminded the House that the pending bill was deeply related to that special work which the Thirty-ninth Congress had assigned itself of building free states out of the ashes of the rebellion.

Following Garfield's speech the House proceeded to vote on the bill and the amendments. The Grinnell amendment lowering the Commissioner's salary and reducing the number of clerks was approved without a recorded vote. The Randall amendment creating a Bureau of Education in the Department of the Interior was defeated by a vote of 53 to 67, with 63 members either absent or not voting. The bill itself was then defeated 59 to 61, again with 63 members not voting.[23] Later the same day, Charles Upson, a Republican from Michigan, moved to reconsider the vote, thus postponing the measure's final defeat in the House.

On June 19, 1866, when the motion to reconsider came before the House, Garfield offered to amend the bill by re-substituting "bureau" for "department," but several members objected to the alteration. Henry Dawes, a Republican from Massachusetts, suggested that the bill be returned to the select committee to broaden the scope of the Department's power. Garfield recognized Dawes' good intentions and indicated that he would support a plan to combine the proposed Department with the Department of Agriculture and a general bureau of statistics but observed that if the House was reluctant to approve the present bill, it would certainly oppose a more comprehensive measure. He ended on a partisan note: "I hope the instinct which has moved the other side of the House to vote solidly against this liberal and progressive measure will at least induce this side to save it from defeat." The motion to reconsider was subsequently passed by a vote of 76 to 48, with 58 not voting, and the bill itself was approved 80 to 44, again with 58 not voting.[24]

Strong evidence, including the testimony of none other than James G. Blaine, Elihu B. Washborne, and Frederick Pike, supports James Garfield's claim to the major portion of the credit for the bill's passage. Between June 8, 1866, and June 19, 1866, Garfield, "by dint of personal entreaty," his colleagues later complained, secured the votes necessary for the bill's approval.[25] Thaddeus Stevens confessed he voted for the bill at the request of Ignatius Donnelly.[26] As Garfield explained to Emerson White in December, 1868:

> *"In the first place the law was never heartily supported by either House of Congress. It was only by the most persistent efforts on my part that the law was passed at all...."*[27]

The Senate began its debate on H.R. 276 on February 26, 1867, late in the second session of the Thirty-ninth Congress. Prior to this date, the bill had been referred to Lyman Trumbull's Judiciary Committee and favorably reported back to the Senate with amendment. Republican John Conness of California suggested early in the debate that "bureau" be substituted for "department," explaining that he favored the bill but felt the use of "department" was confusing when a cabinet level agency was not envisioned.[28] Trumbull explained that "department" was necessary if the Commissioner was to be empowered to appoint his own clerks. A bureau head did not have this power. The argument was somewhat spurious since, of course, Congress could grant such power if it chose to do so. Senator Grimes renewed the suggestion that the educational agency be combined with the Department of Agriculture but won no support for the proposal.

Senators Dixon of Connecticut and Sumner of Massachusetts, often on opposing sides in Senate debates, both spoke in favor of the bill as presented by the committee. Ignoring the need for collecting and disseminating school statistics, they argued for a central agency to promote education in the rebel states. Sumner even expressed the

73

opinion that the Commissioner of Education ought to be a member of the President's cabinet. Senator Conness pointed out that the bill did not propose anything so broad or powerful. Daniel Norton of Minnesota, a War Democrat elected to the Senate as a Union Conservative, expressed his support of the bill in its present form but indicated that he would oppose the measure if it cloaked an attempt to centralize education. Senators Davis of Kentucky and Saulsbury of Delaware, both Democrats, stated their opposition to the bill on the grounds that it interfered with states' rights and was therefore unconstitutional.

The Senate approved the bill as reported by Trumbull on February 27, 1867, without a recorded vote. Charles Buckalew, a Pennsylvania Democrat, then moved to reconsider the vote, and on March 1, 1867, this motion came before the Senate. Without further debate, the motion was defeated by a vote of 7 to 28, with 17 not voting.[29] With the end of the Thirty-ninth Congress rapidly approaching, the bill was forwarded to the President for his signature.

Despite differences of emphasis and interpretation heard on both sides of the argument, certain patterns are evident in the debate on H.R. 276. In both the House and the Senate the proponents of the bill began their arguments by describing the nation's need for more and better schools and a more equal distribution of educational opportunities among the states, especially in the South. Meeting these needs, according to the proponents, fell not merely on the states; it consituted also a federal responsibility. Indeed, to argue otherwise was to deny the urgency of present conditions. Judging from past action, if education were left simply to the states little progress could be expected except in those states already having advanced school systems. Furthermore, if left to the states, the crucial need for education among the freedmen would go wanting. One way to express the national interest in education was to establish the new Department.

As envisioned by its supporters, the Department was to meet the educational needs of the nation in two ways. First, by revealing the actual condition of existing state systems of education through statistical summaries and reports, it would make known the exact nature of these needs. Second, knowing the need and being committed to the general welfare, the Department would be a force for improvement, operating on the educational endeavors of states and local communities and counteracting to some extent the pressure of local customs and prejudices which might tend to alienate particular communities of states from the values and goals prized as necessary for the nation. Although the bill required the Commissioner of Education to study and report on the uses of the federal lands granted the states and territories for the promotion of education, the point did not loom large in the proponents' arguments.

The arguments of the bill's opponents also tended to form a pattern. Several of the speakers voiced concern about the cost of creating and maintaining the Department. They felt its work of collecting and diffusing statistics would duplicate that of the states and therefore would be a waste of federal funds. Others affirmed their confidence in the present system of local and state school control, seeing the bill as an unconstitutional threat to that system. Although a few denied the need for collecting and disseminating school statistics by any level of government, most of the bill's opponents had no quarrel with this general point. Their opposition grew out of the proposed federal involvement in such an operation. As several complained, it was a novel, unheard of, idea. Others hinted that their position was derived in part from their opposition to, if not fear of, educating black people. In the Fortieth Congress the point would be stated explicitly as one of the arguments for abolishing the Department of Education. In sum, the opponents did not agree that education was related to the restoration of the southern states, and they denied that postwar conditions created or revealed critical educational needs requiring federal intervention.

In its final form the Department of Education bill appeared to be a rather modest attempt on the part of Congress to inform itself and the nation on the condition of education in the country and to stimulate improvement through the publication of researches. However, Congress was debating more than the bill. Clearly, proponents of the measure, representing a host of political ideologies, from radical to conservative, expected the Department to be something more than merely a data gathering agency. Working indirectly, perhaps, its aims was to improve local educational practices, make them supportive of national goals, and promote inclusive and equitable educational policies. Recognizing these aims, opponents denounced the idea altogether or else demanded that the Department remain strictly a statistical bureau.

The various arguments appear to be founded on two opposing sets of assumptions about the relationship of the federal government to the states and the best method for educational reform. Relying heavily on the rationale for national education developed by the leaders of the common school movement, the supporters of the Department of Education, although acknowledging the value of local and state control over schools, seemed to express an implicit fear of that control when not provided direction or at least encouragement by a more comprehensive authority. They assumed that states and communities left to their own devices could not, and in some cases, would not meet the nation's educational needs. They were particularly concerned about the national consequences if the federal government did not play a more direct role in promoting the education of both whites and blacks in the South. For some of these supporters, as for some of the educators, there was probably a mixture of politics and vindictiveness in their arguments; but given the long struggle for popular acceptance of the common school, the assumption and the concern it generated were not entirely unwarrented. The external pressure effecting school improvement was to be not federal control but the unprejudiced "truth" of descriptive and statistical comparison of school systems compiled by a federal agency and distributed to all the states.

Antebellum efforts to organize state systems of education had been an application of the proponents' strategy on the state level.

Over against this set of assumptions was another, stated more or less explicitly in the congressional debate and by Frederick Packard. First, the opponents assumed that the states had original jurisdiction over their educational institutions and that they were to be trusted by the federal government to meet educational needs responsibly. The presence of a crisis which justified displacing the traditional localism of American educational structures was expressly denied. The opponents assumed that school improvement originated from within communities rather than in response to outside pressure. To their way of thinking, reform could be accomplished only by the people most directly related to the schools. A third assumption followed from the second, namely, that school improvement would occur on the local level because people generally were convinced of the value of schools.

In light of these assumptions, the congressional debate on H.R. 276 becomes more understandable. The bill's proponents were convinced of the nation's need for more and better schools, particularly in the South. Education was a key, for some the key, to effective reconstruction and the preparation of freedmen for citizenship. The bill, which revealed none of this in its four sections, was simply a step in the right direction, albeit an important one. Those opposing the bill saw in it a threat to cherished values, a way of life, and, for them, the proper means of government.

The debates in both the House and the Senate were rushed, in each case occurring near the end of a session. Perhaps this explains why many of the speeches seemed unrelated to the substance of the bill. If the proposed Department was to be a data gathering and research agency, the means by which these functions were to be carried out should have been considered. Garfield admitted that over one-half of the states in 1866 compiled no statistical reports on their schools. How was the Commissioner to secure data from these states? Was he to be allowed to employ temporary field agents, as Representative Pike asked? If he was to rely upon data provided for him by local and state officials, what recourse would he have if these officials refused to cooperate with him? Also, if the Department was to collect and publish the findings of educational research, was the Commissioner empowered to initiate research? Could he contract with experts to investigate school problems which he perceived to be pressing? All of these questions would return to haunt the agency during its first years of operation.

Garfield's partisan appeal aside, Department proponents cannot be grouped neatly under the Republican banner. Nor were all the opponents Democrats. Such simplifications ignore, for one, the rather large ideological umbrella offered by the Republican party in the 1860s. Radicals, moderates, classical liberals, conservatives, and independents could all be found wearing the Republican label. An analysis of the various House and Senate votes on the Department bill reveals coalitions of all the Republican factions voting on both sides of the bill. Republican opposition, in fact, explains the measure's initial defeat in the House, a result clearly beyond the Democrats' capability. Only on the vote to reconsider and the subsequent second vote on final passage, could Republicans marshall the strength to win approval of the bill by a substantial majority. Testimony from Garfield and several of his colleagues suggests a week of intense cloakroom pressure following the bill's initial defeat to achieve a measure of Republican unity on the Department proposal. And even so, fully one-third of the Republicans abstained. These complex and shifting voting patterns mirror the range of positions on the Department bill which cut across party labels. They provide added evidence of an uncertain congressional mandate for the new agency.

The legislative history of the Department of Education Act constitutes only a portion of the history of the U.S. Office of Education's founding years. Understanding those years requires assessments of the critical role played by Henry Barnard, the first Commissioner of Education, in devising plans for a national educational bureau during the antebellum period. Needed too are examinations of other prewar plans for the agency and of the promises which accompanied its subsequent creation. In 1965, Americans once again are hearing that federally initiated educational reform offers an avenue to social change and the obliteration of inequality. Amid rising expectations, it is helpful to remember that similar promises were made a century ago and to wonder what happened to them.

Notes

1 The original designation, "Department of Education," was later changed to "Bureau of Education" when the agency was placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of the Interior. The U.S. Office of Education, today, is a part of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

2 Edgar B. Wesley, *NEA: The First Hundred Years* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 244.

3 S. H. White, "A National Bureau of Education," *American Journal of Education*, 15:181.

4 *Ibid*. p. 182

5 National Teachers' Association, *Proceedings of the Fifth [Sixth] Annual Meeting* (Hartford, 1865), p. 220.

6 James P. Wickersham, "Education As An Element in Reconstruction," *American Journal of Education*, 16:283-297.

7 Andrew J. Rickoff, "A National Bureau of Education," *American Journal of Education*, 16:299-310.

8 National Teachers' Association, *Proceedings* (1865), p. 227.

9 Wesley, p. 283.

10 U.S., *Congressional Globe*, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., 1866, 36:60;

11 Emerson E. White, "National Bureau of Education," *American Journal of Education*, 16:184.

12 *Ibid*.

13 The memorial is reprinted in Alexander Shiras, *The National Bureau of Education: Its History, Work and Limitations* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1875), pp. 1-3.

14 The committee consisted of Garfield of Ohio, Chairman; Patterson of New Hampshire; Boutwell of Massachusetts; Donnelly of Minnesota; Moulton of Illinois; Goodyear of New York; and Randall of Pennsylvania. Goodyear, Moulton, and Randall were Democrats; the others were Republicans.

15 See, "The *Department of Education at Washington: 1867-1870*," *American Journal of Education*, 30:193N.

16 U.S., *Congressional Globe*, 39th Cong. 1st Sess., 1866, 36:2966.

17. *Ibid*., pp. 2966-2968.

18 *Ibid*., p. 2968.

19 See Raymond Culver, *Horace Mann and Religion in the Massacusetts Public Schools* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939), pp. 55-110.

20 Frederick A. Packard, *The Daily Public School in the United States* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1866).

21 *Ibid*., pp. 150-151. For Emerson White's bitter denunciation of Packard's book, see *Ohio Educational Monthly*, 15:356.

22 See George S. Boutwell, *Reminiscences of Sixty Years in Public Affairs* (New York: McClure, Phillips, & Co., 1902), 11, 16.

23 U.S. *Congressional Globe*, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. 1866, 36:3051.

24 *Ibid*., p. 3070.

25 U.S., *Congressional Globe*,, 40th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1868, 39:1140.

26 *Ibid*., p. 3704.

27 Letter from Garfield to White, December 26, 1868, Garfield Papers, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

28 U.S., *Congressional Globe*, 39th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1867, 37:1842.

29 *Ibid*., p. 1950.

THE IOWA EXPERIMENT
WITH AN
INTEGRATED SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

by

Edward Rutkowski
Professor of Education
University of Northern Iowa

Introduction

The State of Iowa presents to the educational historian a fertile and interesting area of study. Its uniqueness is represented by its location in the center of the country.[1] Iowa, geographically, is the most homogenous large state in the United States with the least contrast in topography and economy of any state with the exception of Rhode Island.[2] The homogeneity of the state is also well illustrated by its population. The state population has been unusually level since the last decades of the 19th century, growing from a little over two million to two and three quarters million at present.[3] The social composition of the population has also been amazingly stable. It is made up of many small towns, a few urban centers and a predominantly agricultural economy.

The state dates back to the earliest explorations of our country because of its favored position on the Mississippi River. Jacques Marquette and Louis Joliet were the first white men to explore Iowa.[4] However, the actual full scale development of the state came in the early decades of the 19th century after the Louisiana Purchase, of which the Iowa Territory was a part. By 1846, there was sufficient growth that Iowa was admitted to the Union as the 29th state.[5] Immigration to Iowa, however, reached its peak in 1855. One of the important characteristics of the early pioneer groups was that they were a majority of native born Americans. They came from nearby states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and the more northernly sections of the southern states. When the first railroads in the late 1850's reached Iowa, new additions in the state population came from New York and New England. These groups, because of their American backgrounds and interest in education, very early attempted to establish a state system. Horace Mann was brought to the state in 1851 as an advisor to help organize it. As a result, the first state constitution called for the establishment of an office of superintendent of public instruction, the creation of a school fund, and the erection of a system of common schools.[6]

In its early years, Iowa was a microcosm of American educational growth and development. Its legacy was the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, and the township grants provided for by the ordinance served as the grants for the establishment of the State University of Iowa in 1847.[7] In 1868, with the aid of the Morrill Land Grant Act, the legislature established the Iowa State College of Agriculture,[8] The people also had an early interest in teacher education and a number of normal schools and teacher seminaries were started. However, these schools lasted for varied periods of time and they eventually closed either for lack of finances or students. It was not until 1876, when a closed state orphanage was taken over at Cedar Falls that the Iowa State Normal School was successfully established for the training of teachers.[9]

Genesis of the Problem

By the end of the 19th century, Iowa had a population of two million people, a well developed commercial agriculture economy, and a homogenous small town society whose business interests were mainly based on serving the needs of the farm population. The state, educationally, had an extensive secondary and elementary school system. There were also many private and sectarian small town liberal arts colleges that dotted the state.

Each state institution had its own board of regents overseeing its interests. The University of Iowa at Iowa City was the biggest of the three with the largest enrollment of 1,500 students.[10] Iowa State College of Agriculture at Ames which had been established two decades after the state university was a school with an enrollment of around 1,200 students.[11] The last of the institutions, Iowa State Normal School at Cedar Falls had developed into one of the outstanding normal schools of the country and had an enrollment of 1,000 students.[12]

These schools in their growing years of the last decades of the 19th century were developing their own roles. The state university became the institution which offered general and professional education, liberal, scientific, and graduate study traditionally allied with university work. The land grant agricultural college developed the practical, agricultural, scientific engineering and allied studies which were the core of the land grant philosophy. The state normal school had expanded and broadened its role in professional teacher preparation.[13] Its early program was a two year course for the preparation of the elementary and rural school teachers. However, as the state high school system expanded, the program at the normal school was modified to include four year degree programs for the preparation of high school teachers.[14]

On the other hand, although the three state institutions flourished, problems in their operation began to occur more frequently. There was the problem of controlling the growth of these three dynamic institutions. Each school had its own loyal board of regents lobbying for its interests. Curriculums that once seemed to be well-delineated and defined were beginning to overlap. For example, liberal arts courses were maintained at all three schools. The teacher preparation programs at the university and the normal school for high school teachers appeared to many critics to be a duplication of effort. Between the state university and the land grant college there developed what appeared to many concerned Iowans a duplication between some scientific and engineering courses.[15]

These concerns had been raised by the school officials themselves. During the administration of President Charles A. Schaeffer at the University of Iowa, he proposed to drop all teacher preparation at the school and transfer this work to Iowa State Normal School. Schaeffer believed that this would free the university to concentrate its resources on scientific study which was his major interest. However, Homer Seerley, President of the Iowa State Normal School and a graduate of the state university believed that the school should not drop its work in education. He persuaded President Schaeffer to appoint a new professor of education and the department was continued at the state university.[16]

However, financial problems, which were the major concern, were not to be settled as amicably. The first years of the twentieth century were periods of depression and inflation in the nation and Iowa. The problem of rising costs was compounded by the problem of the autonomous board of regents for each institution. Although the members of these boards were nominally selected by the legislature, they were chosen by the district caucus of the two major political parties at each state convention. There was a gentlemen's agreement between the two parties that the majority party would have a certain proportion of membership on each board and the minority a certain proportion. The recommendations for board members made by the party caucuses were usually endorsed by the legislature. These selections were not only political but many of these appointees were business men who had a financial interest connected with the institution or were prominent alumni with a deep sense of loyalty. The governing bodies of these schools increasingly pressured the legislature for funds, and as their needs increased, so did the intensity and rivalry.[17]

The result was a great deal of fiscal confusion and lobbying pressure within the legislature. It became their practice because of the increasing difficulty of settling this problem to wait until the end of the session to appropriate the available funds. Each session brought with it more financial demands and as a result legislators began to react. There was a growing suspicion on their part that the funds made available were not being wisely used. As early as 1890, this issue lead to a proposal to place all the state institutions under a single board of control.[18]

It would take three sessions of the legislature to agree upon a board of control law. The idea, however, gradually gained support and finally became a bill which was heatedly debated in the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly in 1898. A bitter and successful fight was carried on by the alumni and the proponents of the measure were compelled to modify their original plan. The bill was passed in an amended form which created a board of control for the management of the state institutions, in regard to their financial operations.[19]

In the intervening years, it became clear that the state board of control was working out and the pressure for more funds would continue. For example, the University of Iowa from 1847 until 1855, had a yearly average expenditure for its total operation only slightly more than $29,000 a year. By 1905, however, the total yearly budget had grown to over a third of a million dollars and in an inflationary period was continuing to climb.[20]

The growing rivalry for more funds was primarily a result of the expanding demands for more and improved education. At no time did the land grants to the schools cover but a small portion of their expenses. Bills were introduced for the leveling of state millage taxes for their support but the levies were only for building purposes and many legislators became critical because this money was spent too automatically. Although the general millage approach was brought up as a solution, there was no strong support to make the schools financially independent of the legislature. There existed a permanent annual appropriation fund but this was never adequate, and the legislature always had to add funds each session. As a result the lobbying was accelerated with the financial demands of the schools.

The public and press were beginning to question the traditions that were developing. A newspaper editorial of the Des Moines Leader of April 1, 1899, described the situation in these terms when it stated:

> "The University of Iowa ought not to be placed in the humiliating position of begging, at the hand of each succeeding legislature, the means for existence. It is demoralizing in every way. It cannot fail to drag the institution into politics, the place from which the concerns of an educational establishment ought to be excluded. The regents are too often compelled to submit themselves to political influences.... Such things cannot but injure the University."[21]

During the legislative session of 1902 in the debate over the educational appropriation, it was reported by the press that sentiment was developing for the creation of The Board of Control. The movement seemed enough a threat for alumni and board members of the three schools to organize and lobby against the proposed legislation. The bill, however, was not passed, but another measure was introduced in 1904. Again, there was a great deal of discussion which was described as the most spirited debate of the whole session.

The lobbying pressure during this assembly was tremendous. The issue was brought to a head by the action of a legislative committee which had visited the state university in February and made the recommendation that all its engineering work be transferred to the agricultural college at Ames. This recommendation stirred the alumni, students, and friends of the university to action. A petition was signed by the students and forwarded to the legislature opposing the transfer of the department. The Iowa City Commercial Club sponsored a visit of the entire state legislature and their staff to the campus on March 24, 1904. Speeches were made and the legislators were paraded through long lines of students. The campus newspaper printed a special edition including a picture of the sixty members of the engineering society with the caption, "Shall these be taken away?" In a statewide alumni meeting in Des Moines the next day, a gathering of nearly one hundred interested people drew up a strongly worded petition which they sent to the legislature.

These efforts were not without their effect and the legislature appropriated $208,000 in special funds to develop a School of Applied Science. These funds were received by President MacLean as a commission for the further development of engineering at the university.[23] However, a bill was passed in the Senate, to be defeated in the House two days later, to establish a board of control. Despite the defeat of the measure, its proponents were able to muster enough support to introduce into the Senate a joint resolution calling for the appointment of a bi-partisan committee from both houses to investigate the complete state system of higher education. The legislative reaction to the lobbying and alumni pressure can be measured by the vote in both houses which was unanimous. The committee was chosen by the speakers who selected three members each and was instructed to report its findings at the next session.[24]

The committee was headed by Senator William P. Whipple of Vinton who was also the chairman of the committee on penitentiaries and pardons and a strong advocate of a unified board. It became known as the Whipple Committee and between the sessions of the legislature proceeded to carry on its investigation.[25] They visited the schools in Iowa and the universities of neighboring states. They also solicited the opinions of university presidents, educators, and administrators.

The formal report was submitted to the Thirty-First Assembly in January, 1906. In a report of over two hundred pages, the Whipple Committee proposed that the entire control of the state schools be placed under one board. More importantly, it documented for the first time the perennial issues that had been raised but not resolved. The report was decidedly unfavorable to the schools and their policies of operation. The committee summarized the problems as financial, administrative, and instructional. The basic charge was that there was a considerable duplication of work between the institutions, some of which was held to be wholly unnecessary. The contention of the committee was that the people of the state should not be taxed twice for the same service. The university and the agriculture college were accused of operating their high school preparatory departments for the purpose of raiding each others students. The committee also charged that the state normal school had become a miniature university in duplicating its program after the University of Iowa. As a result, the committee believed that there existed a great deal of financial waste and duplication in higher education and high school programs. Moreover, the committee charged that the duplication in curriculum had also created duplication in administration which had led to an unhealthy rivalry between the schools. For these reasons, the committee recommended that a board of control be established over all the state institutions, with ample powers to coordinate the program of higher education in the state.[26]

Senator Whipple led the fight to have his committee report adopted and on February 14, 1906, a bill was presented to the Senate which provided for a board of fifteen members. The bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 32 to 16, but it met with strong opposition in the House. It failed to pass and this ended the efforts at reform for that session.[27] A constitutional amendment had made it possible to have another session of the legislature the next year and Senator Whipple returned to fight for his bill. Again on February 1, 1907, the measure was introduced and passed decisively by the Senate only again to have the House fail to go along with the measure by a margin of 58-45. Senator Whipple was not discouraged and he returned with the bill again to the Thirty-Third Assembly of 1909. In the intervening time events and ideas were culminating in bringing about a climate for acceptance. The Whipple Committee report had drawn support from a majority of the newspapers of the state. Increased enrollments were driving up the cost of higher education. The student body at the state university had grown 71 percent in the intervening five-year period which was an addition of over 1,000 students. The resulting pressure for funds for faculty and facilities was creating an atmosphere for change.[28]

However, the bill was not to be accepted without extensive debate. A number of alternate proposals were made either weakening the bill or crippling the overall power of the board. Nevertheless, for the first time the House passed the bill with amendments which were quickly accepted by the Senate by the overwhelming majority of 42 votes with 7 absent or not voting. It was an overwhelming legislative victory for the reform forces and the governor approved the measure on March 29, 1909.

The measure called for the creation of "The State Board of Education," prescribing its duties and broadly empowering it to provide for the management and control of the state schools. The board would be composed of nine members of which not more than five could be of the same political party, and not more than three could be alumni with only one serving from each school. The act provided for the appointment, length of term, removal, time of meetings, and duties of the board. It also called for the creation of a finance committee of three members who were to be selected by the board from outside its membership. The board was given wide powers in terms of finances, personnel, and program.[29]

Sentiment in the state over the bill was sharply divided. Some newspapers hailed the work of the Whipple Committee and legislature as the most significant contribution ever made in Iowa for the cause of education.[30] Other newspapers voiced opposition or were much more cautious. The presidents of the schools also reacted in various ways toward the bill. President MacLean of Iowa voiced an attitude of caution in his statement that he would try to 'loyally cooperate with them in trying what I conceive to be a great experiment.'[32] On the other hand, President Storm of Iowa State College was so opposed to the idea of central control that the passage of the bill caused him to submit his resignation in March, 1910. His final report was prefaced by the remark that the board could "doubtless work out the policies best with an executive of their own choosing."[33] Homer Seerley, at Cedar Falls, in the beginning was very cautious, but within a short period of time, he would also begin to voice his opposition.[34]

The three institutions were formally taken over July 1, 1909. In April, the new board had taken office and Mr. James Trewin of Cedar Rapids was elected its first president. He in turn selected the finance committee with Mr. W. R. Boyd as chairman, Mr. Thomas Lambert, a State Senator and former member of the Whipple Committee as one member and as the other member Daniel A. Emery, a banker from Ottumwa, who was made committee secretary. This committee was to play a key role in the final plans for coordination of the three state institutions.[35]

The Coordination Controversy 1912-1913

The new board of education considered its primary obligation to develop a plan of integration for the state system of education. In its first biennial report, it stated this conviction when they proposed "that the institutions governed by the board should be coordinate parts of the general educational system of Iowa." They also believed that they were bringing the best of business and economic expertise to bear on this question when they stated:

> "In any democracy which is to thrive, this respect and confidence must be felt strongly by the majority of the population. In the conduct of private or corporation business in the United States the employment of experts is well recognized as the only rational and successful method. No one things of building a bridge or a dam or setting up a power house or a cotton mill without relying absolutely upon the advice of intelligent experts. A democracy must learn in governmental affairs, whether municipal, state, or nation, to employ experts and abide by their decisions."[37]

> "It may be said, however, that the Board aims at economy in education as in business, and to make the various departments of our educational system meet the needs of the people of Iowa."[38]

The board announced it would make a scientific study of conditions within the institutions in order to find out the best way to eliminate duplication and to effect economies in operation. In April, 1912, the board passed a resolution requesting Dr. K. C. Babcock, a higher education specialist in the U.S. Bureau of Education, to make a study and to report with a plan pointing toward the closer coordination of the schools. Three months later in July, the finance committee of the board who had been assigned the task of judging the feasibility of such a plan reported their findings.[39]

The finance committee reported a coordination plan that called for a sweeping reorganization of the total state system of public education. Basically it outlined a hierarchical structure with the state university and colleges at the apex. All the schools were to be part of the plan. The elementary schools were to be the base of the system with a high school and a vocational school to be established in each school district. The committee stated that there should be no rigid lines between these two kinds of secondary education and that these facilities should be maintained in every local community. However, they realized that the Board of Education had no control over these schools. Instead, their report was to deal with bringing the three state institutions into working relationship within this new design. In conclusion, the board stated that it was wrong to look at the state institutions as three separate schools but they should be one institution with each school campus having a particular function.[40] The committee concluded that by taking this approach they had achieved a workable plan.

They believed that there existed a serious duplication of programs in the areas of engineering, teacher education, liberal arts, and home economics. To reorganize the schools they recommended that all the engineering programs be centered at the agricultural college at Ames. All the courses in professional education and liberal arts above the sophomore level at Iowa State Teachers College were to be discontinued and the school was to concentrate on two-year programs for preparation of rural and elementary teachers. All high school teachers and school administrators were to be trained at the state university. Statistics to support the necessity of such changes were presented to show that the great need in the state was still elementary and rural school teachers. Finally, the courses in general science, liberal arts, and the home economics were to be transferred to the university. The number of Iowa State students at Ames in general science was small. Also there were 795 women enrolled at the university and the home economics program at Ames had only 148 girls. The committee reasoned that women students would best be taken care of at the university because their education could be best complimented by have liberal arts and home economics together at the same institution. The proposed plan had a distinct economic and business flavor. It was characterized as Iowa's contribution to "the business efficiency in education."[41]

The plan was submitted to seven of the leading educators of the country for their comments and criticism. They were Dr. Kenrick

Babcock, the specialist from the U.S. Bureau of Education; Dr. Henry Pritchett, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; Dr. A. Ross Hill, President of the University of Missouri; Dr. Charles R. Van Hise, President of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Andrew Draper, Commissioner of Education of the State of New York; and Dean James E. Russell of Teachers College, Columbia. All of these prominent educators with the exception of Andrew Draper believed that the plan had merit and approved its general design. Draper alone stated that in his opinion the plan was far too experimental to succeed.[42]

The affirmative comments of these educators encouraged the board members to formally adopt the report on Ocotber 8, 1912, with six members voting for the plan, one against, and two members absent. The action of the board was announced to the press and the proposed changes were to go into effect in September, 1913.[43] The response of the public to the board's coordination plan was immediate. It was an election year, and the plan became a political issue on which an opinion had to be expressed by any candidate for office. The press of the state again was divided on the issue. The press at Des Moines and the cities where the schools were located was highly critical. During the next six months the issue was to become a center of heated public controversy, and over one hundred and eleven articles, editorials, and letters were printed on the subject in the Des Moines Register and Leader.

The alumni and students of the schools became beehives of activity immediately with the announcements of the plan. The centers of student protest were the engineering students at both schools. They organized the other students and carried on the brunt of the public campaign. Every propaganda device was utilized with mass meetings, demonstrations, stunts at football games and letter writing campaigns used to influence the public.

Arguments for the rejection of the plan came from some of the board members, themselves. Mr. Roger Leavitt, from Cedar Falls, a board member who was absent when the vote was taken filed a protest shortly after the plan was announced. He stated that the board's action was without his knowledge and that such a plan was unadvisable because the three presidents of the schools had not been consulted. Dr. Draper's negative criticisms of the plan were also used as evidence to indicate that the plan was unfeasible. However, the opposition's major argument was based on the contention that the board's action was unconstitutional, because the state constitution stated that the work of the university could not be divided. The argument lost much of its momentum when it was pointed out by defenders of the plan that these courses were not being divided but merely discontinued at the different schools.

The presidents of the three institutions also became deeply involved in the controversy. Homer Seerley, President of the Teacher's College, wrote some forty letters to influential public leaders and alumni to get them to use their influence on the board members or candidates for the legislature. President Bowman, the new head of the University of Iowa had publicly agreed to the coordination plan when he was appointed. However, after a few months he changed his mind and became one of its opponents. When he resigned a year later, the plan was one of the major reasons given for his resignation.[45]

Student action continued to be a key factor in keeping the issue alive during the fall. At the state university a central comittee for students was formed to coordinate the students' activities. Under the auspices of this committee, pep meetings, discussions, speeches, debate programs were continued and a tag day was organized to raise money. This student committee published a bulletin regarding the crisis which was distributed statewide. Also, an Iowa Alumni group under the leadership of James B. Weaver, published a fifty-page booklet on "Iowa's Education Problem," for state distribution.[46]

Despite the pressure from those who opposed the new plan, throughout the fall and winter President James H. Trewin, Chairman of the State Board of Education, and the majority of the board stood their ground. The board rejected all demands and in their March meeting of 1913, ordered the schools to include in their next catalogs statements of the coordination plan.[47] President Seerley of the State Teachers College requested that the action be delayed for one year for further study, but the board denied his request.[48]

After the fall elections the issue becomes a legislative matter. When the 1913 General Assembly met the coordination controversy became the question to be debated. The month of February of that session has been described as one of the most bitter struggles in Iowa legislative history. Resolutions were introduced in both houses calling upon the board to rescind its action. Three bills in the Senate and one bill in the House were presented. However, the bills were so different that the added amendments were not acceptable to the Senate and the measures were never formally passed. The bill originating in the House was never reported out of committee. Nevertheless, the house opposition to the board's action was sufficiently strong to pass a resolution opposing the plan. The legislature had demonstrated enough disapproval that on April 3, 1913, the board adopted a resolution rescinding the coordination order of October 8, 1912. The resolution was recorded in the minutes of the board on April 4, 1913, "In obedience to the request of the General Assembly."[49]

Thus, the State Board of Education's major campaign for coordination had been successfully defeated. Never again would there be a major effort for a comprehensive solution to the problems of higher education in Iowa. Paradoxically, as a result of the controversy, it was reported that a new spirit of cooperation appeared on the campuses of the state schools. The next year an enrollment increase of 400 students at the University of Iowa which was the largest in its history was attributed to climate created by the coordination struggle. The engineering school at the University doubled its freshman enrollment to 100 students. At the beginning of the controversy there had been only 168 students in the whole program. Whatever the causes for the increased enrollments the institutions were relieved over the outcome of the issue.[50]

In 1915, the State Board of Education asked the U.S. Commissioner of Education, P.P. Claxton to make a survey of the higher education institutions in the state. In its proposal the board made it clear that it has no desire to reopen the coordination question, but wished to be guided in the possible reduction of duplication without recourse to the radical measures of 1912. As a result of the board's request, the Claxton commission did make some recommendations to change the character of the work of the engineering schools and proposed the elimination of some liberal arts courses at Iowa State Teachers College. They also called for the establishment of more normal schools in the state. On the administrative level, there were a number of significant proposals. One which was an outgrowth of the coordination controversy, was the requirement that the presidents of the schools be present at all board meetings. In regard to duplication of schools programs, the commission report stated that there was far less cost in duplication of certain aspects of the different curriculums of the schools than was thought previously. The commission also developed a modified approach to the coordination problem by developing the notion that each school might have unique functions in their major lines of work, but there must exist necessary duplication in their service lines of work such as in liberal arts and science course. They concluded that this kind of programming was desirable and educationally sound.[51]

A decade later in 1925, another survey was made with particular reference to problems of duplication. This committee was under the chairmanship of President S.P. Capen of the University of Buffalo. Its report recommended that any consolidation was now unadvisable. There was a recommendation to divide the teacher education between the various schools but the State Board of Education only approved the placing of all the training of Smith-Hughes teachers at Ames and gave Iowa State Teachers College the exclusive right to prepare vocational teachers in business.

During the depression period of 1933 the Brookings Institute made another survey at the invitation of the state Democratic administration. Again, the question of engineering was raised but the board refused to change the accepted permanent pattern. Nevertheless, in 1939 the issue of duplication was brought up in a bill introduced in the General Assembly. It called for the closing of the engineering school at the state university and transferring its equipment and property to Ames. However, the State Board of Education had already appointed a new commission under Dr. Capen to conduct a survey with recommendations concerning duplication in courses and facilities. The proposed transfer bill was abandoned and in its place a resolution was passed requesting that the State Board of Education report its survey findings to the governor. The Capen Survey made only a few recommendations that would affect the system. The report was a

89

vindication of the institutions in that it found not one case of unnecessary duplication between the course offerings of the schools. In response to its recommendations, an inter-institution committee to watch curriculum was set by the Board.[53]

Because of World War II, there was no systematic survey of higher education in Iowa until 1950. The problems brought on by the war and postwar expansion were investigated by a commission headed by George D. Strayer of Columbia University. This report called for more institutional cooperation. It suggested that the Board solicit the assistance of committees composed of inner-institutional faculty to work on the major problems and also recommended that coordination of efforts be made on a voluntary rather than compulsory basis.[54]

By the 1960's the enrollment growth of the Iowa institutions was phenomenal. The state teachers college enrollment had grown to the point that an expansion in program was deemed desirable. In 1961, the name of the school was officially changed by the legislature to State College of Iowa in line with its expansion into more liberal arts programs. Its growth continued and in 1967 the school received permission to become a university. In the discussion of the enabling bill for university status there was some debate over duplication of programs but there was more discussion over a name for the school.

The faculty committee that recommended the new organizational pattern for the university in a study discovered that the school had only one course that was exclusive in its program that was not available at the other two state institutions, indicating that all three had broadly defined curriculums. One can conclude that the problem of curriculum coordination has been finally resolved by the progressive growth of higher education in the State of Iowa.

Summary and Conclusions

The State of Iowa has made a major historical contribution to the study of administrative potentialities of a unified system of education. Although it was not the first state of establish a unified board of control it was one of the first states in Midwest to construct such a system. In its attempts at complete unification and subsequent work in trying to create a viable system it has been hailed by educators as a model for solution of their problems in other states.[55] Certainly, the complete unification of the original plan was never achieved, but the state schools were taken out of the rough and tumble of politics and lobbying for legislative funds. A study of history of the development of the system of higher education in Iowa affords one the opportunity to study educational policies and their viability in a unique social setting. The Iowa system has been successful in giving a sense of purpose and design to higher education. However, it also illustrates that these institutions have a life of their own which develop a momentum that once begun becomes difficult to change.

Certainly, the social climate of Iowa at the turn of the century was ripe for the establishment of an integrated system of education. Iowa possessed the favorable conditions to effect such changes. Nevertheless, although the state was a political and educational unit with its own economic base, the schools that were established to serve Iowa also served the educational and personal interests of the administration, students, alumni and friends of the institutions. For example, although the educational demands of the state called for the preparation of elementary and rural teachers, the national movement for the upgrading of teacher education had led to the demand for the inclusion of more college and university work. Homer Seerley, President of Iowa State Teachers College for 42 years was an active official of the NEA. He had worked hard for the upgrading of normal schools, and teacher education and certainly would not accept a limited role for his institution. Seerley succeeded in having the name of the school changed to Iowa State Teachers College in 1909 which made this school one of the early pioneers in state teacher college movement.[56]

The failure of the plan was not necessarily in the scheme of its organization. Its failure was because of the lack of foresight of the board not to include the key administrators, and the faculties, students, and alumni of the schools in aspects of the decision making process. These people were the public whose support would be the key to the success of such a plan. Also, the plan did not take into account the dynamics of an educational process. In the haste to adopt the plan, the reform members of the Board were too inflexible. The Board believing their duty was only to the people of the State of Iowa, failed to see their duty in regard to the institutions. If there is a lesson to be learned from this experiment in higher education it is that an educational system needs not only to be logical and businesslike in its operation but more importantly it must be responsive to those involved in its very process or it will fail.

NOTES

1 Interview with H.L. Nelson, April 9, 1968.

2 H.L. Nelson, A Geography of Iowa (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), p. 11.

3 Nelson, op. cit. pp. 79-80.

4 Leonard F. Parker, Higher Education in Iowa (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1893), p. 9.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 10.

6 Clarence R. Aurner, History of Education in Iowa, Vol. I (Iowa City: The State Historical Society of Iowa, 1914), pp. 29-48.

7 Parker, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

91

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 53.

10 Des Moines Register and Leader, January 7, 1906, p. 1.

11 Parker, op. cit., pp. 73-74.

12 *Ibid.*, pp. 55-6.

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 53-121.

14 David Sands Wright, Fifty Years at the Teachers College, (Cedar Falls: Iowa State Teachers College, 1926), pp. 208-211.

15 Jay B. MacGregor, "The Genesis and Growth of the Control and Administration of the State University of Iowa" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, College of Education, University of Iowa, 1931) p. 101.

16 Homer A. Seerley, "Iowa as a Pioneer in the Preparation of Teachers", Fifty Years of Progress ed. Charles L. Robbins, College of Education, Series No. 13 University of Iowa Extension Bulletin (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1925), p. 36.

17 Wright, op. cit., pp. 147-148.

18 Irwing S. Hart, The First 75 Years (Cedar Falls: Iowa State Teachers College, 1951) p. 31.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 18

20 MacGregor, op. cit., p. 71.

21 Des Moines Leader, April 1, 1899, p. 4.

22 Franklin A. Doty, "History of the State University of Iowa, the College of Liberal Arts." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Iowa, 1946.) P. 48.

23 *Ibid.*, pp. 102-103.

24 MacGregor, op. cit., p. 73.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 71.

26 Des Moines Register and Leader, January 7, 1908, p. 1.

27 MacGregor, op. cit., p. 94.

28 Doty, op. cit., p. 108.

29 MacGregor, op. cit., p. 94.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 94.

31 Earle D. Ross, A History of Iowa State College (Ames: The Iowa State College Press, 1942) p. 263.

32 Doty, op. cit., p. 52.

33 Ross, op. cit., p. 264.

34 Hart, op. cit., p. 33.

35 Doty, op. cit., p. 53.

36 Iowa State Board of Education, First Biennial Report, 1910: p. 8.

37 *Ibid.*

38 *Ibid.*, p. 9.

39 Hart, op. cit., p. 19.

40 *Finance* Committee Report, Plan of Coordination, Iowa State Board of Education, July 16, 1912. Apprendix MacGregor op. cit., p. 278.

41 *Ibid.*, p. 285.

42 *Iowa Board* of Education, Second Biennial Report, 1912, p. 25-26.

43 Hart, op. cit., p. 19.

44 MacGregor, op cit.

45 Doty, op. cit., p. 131.

46 *Ibid.*, p. 248.

47 MacGregor, op. cit., p. 131.

48 Doty, op. cit., p. 248.

49 *Ibid.*

50 *Ibid.*

51 *Ibid.*, p. 265-267.

52 Hart, op. cit., p. 35.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 85-86.

54 *Ibid.*

55 Excerpt from a letter addressed to W.H. Gemmill, Secretary of the Iowa State Board of Education, signed by Henry Suzzallo, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Des Moines, Iowa, February 16, 1931. (In file of the Board.)

56 Edward Rutkowski, "A Study of Various Viewpoints Expressed Concerning the Establishment of University Schools of Education 1890-1905" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1963.)

PART II

PROGRAM

National History of Education Society
and
Mid-West History of Education Society

First Joint Meeting

Chicago
Loyola University

October 24-27, 1973

Wednesday, October 24, 1973

Registration Regis Room – 1:00-3:00 p.m.

3:00- 5:00 p.m. – Regis Room

Welcome John Wozniak, Dean
School of Education, Loyola University

Introduction Vincent P. Lannie, Vice-President
National History of Education Society

Topic THE ROLE OF TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS IN THE SOUTH

Chairman Wayne J. Urban
Georgia State University

Speakers Fred Salzillo, University of Virginia
Teacher Associations and Early Schooling in the South, 1830-1860
Wayne J. Urban, Georgia State University
The Atlanta Federation of Teachers, Origins and Resurgence, 1900-1920
De Los Carroll, University of South Florida
Crisis in the Duval Education Association, Jackson, Florida, 1935-1945

7:30- 9:30 p.m. – Georgetown Room

Topic FUTURE TRENDS IN HISTORY OF EDUCATION

Chairman Robert Church, Northwestern University

Panelists Paul Violas, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana
R. Freeman Butts, Teachers College, Columbia University
Carl F. Kaestle, University of Wisconsin
Robert L. Church, Northwestern University

Thursday, October 25, 1973

10:00-12:00 noon – Regis Room

Topic HISTORIOGRAPHY OF RUSSIAN AND SOVIET EDUCATION

Chairman William W. Brickman
University of Pennsylvania

Speakers Patrick L. Alston
Bowling Green State University
Historiography of Pre-Revolutionary Russian Education
William W. Brickman
University of Pennsylvania
Historiography of Soviet Education

Commentator William H. E. Johnson
University of Pittsburgh

3:00- 5:00 p.m. – Georgetown Room

Topic VARIETIES OF EDUCATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

Chairwoman Maxine Greene, Teachers College,
Columbia University

Speakers Geraldine Joncich
University of California, Berkeley
The Uses of Biography
John Messerli, Fordham University
Horace Mann
Charles Strickland, Emory University
Louisa May Alcott

7:30- 9:30 p.m. – Georgetown Room

Topic UTOPIANISM AND EDUCATION

Chairman Gerald Gutek, Loyola University

Speakers Robert Clouse, Indiana State University
Millennialism and Education

Gerald Gutek, Loyola University
Robert Owen's New Harmony Experiment: An Example of Communitarian Education
Charles Burgess, University of Washington
New Harmony: A House Divided

7:30- 9:30 p.m. – Regis Room

Chairman Robert Cross, University of Virginia

Speakers Vincent P. Lannie, University of Notre Dame
Historiography of American Catholic Education
Timothy H. Morrissey, St. Thomas College
Archbishop John Ireland and the School Controversy of the 1890's

Commentator Robert Cross, University of Virginia

Friday, October 26, 1973

10:00-12:00 noon – Regis Room

Topic THE HUMANITIES AND HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

Chairman Paul Nash, Boston University

Speakers William E. Russell, National Endowment for the Humanities
The Humanities in Humanistic Education
Paul Nash, Boston University
Some Historical Antecedents of Humanistic Education

10:00-12:00 noon – Presidents Room

Topic QUANTITATIVE AND DEMOGRAPHIC PERSPECTIVES ON THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION

Chairman Harvey J. Graff

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Speakers Kenneth A. Lockridge, University of Michigan
Literacy and Modernization in Early America
Selwyn K. Toren
University of Missouri-Columbia
Defining Educational Change Through Patterns of School Attendance: The Case of St. Louis, 1860-1920

Commentators: **Harvey J. Graff and Ian E. Davey**
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and University of Toronto

3:00- 5:00 p.m. – Georgetown Room

Chairman **Frank Nelson**
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Speakers Carl H. Gross,* Michigan State University
The History of the Sokagakkia Movement and Its Educational Implications
Joseph Kirschner,* Youngstown State University
A. S. Neill, Summerhill and the Anarchist Tradition

*This address is published in Part I of this edition of the journal.

PRESIDENTIAL BANQUET

Allerton Hotel, Cloud Room

Cocktail Hour
5:00-6:00 p.m.

6:00 p.m. Roast Beef Dinner $6.50

Welcome

Adelia Peters, President
Mid-West History of Education Society

Introduction

John Calam, President
National History of Education Society

Speaker

*Patricia A. Graham, Past President
National HIstory of Education Society
American Education at the Turn of the Century

*This address is published in Part of this edition of the journal.

Saturday, October 27, 1973

9:00-11:00 a.m. – Georgetown Room

Chairwoman Helen Archibald, Emory and Henry College
Normand R. Bernier*
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
National Identity and Education: Symbols and Reality
Rosemary Donatelli,* Loyola University
Ella Flagg Young: Chicago School Superintendent 1909-1915

*This address is published in Part I of this edition of the journal.

BUSINESS MEETINGS

Board of Directors Meeting

National History of Education Society

Friday, October 26 – 1:00-2:00 p.m.

Business Meeting

Mid-West History of Education Society

Saturday, October 27 – 11:30-12:00 noon
Georgetown Room

Business Meeting

National History of Education Society

Saturday, October 27 – 12:00-12:30 p.m.
Georgetown Room

MINUTES OF THE MID-WEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

October 27, 1973

The Mid-West History of Education Society convened for its business meeting at 11:30 a.m. Saturday, October 27, 1973 in the Regis Room of Loyola University with Professor Adelia M. Peters of Bowling Green State University presiding.

The Society expressed its appreciation to Professor Edward Rutkowski of the University of Northern Iowa for the excellent first issue of the *Journal of the Mid-West History of Education Society*. Professor Rutkowski reported that the financial situation of the *Journal* looked very promising, especially if each member of the Society would encourage the library of his institution to subscribe to the *Journal*.

Professor Frank C. Nelsen of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was nominated President; Professor David Ripley was nominated Program Chairman; and Professor Rosemary Donnatelli of Loyola University was nominated Secretary. All nominees were unanimously elected. The members expressed their appreciation to Professor Peters for her leadership of the Society during the past year and especially for her participation in planning the first joint meeting with the National History of Education Society. The Society also expressed its appreciation for the excellent program prepared by Professor Nelsen as Program Chairman for 1973.

Professor Ripley solicited suggestions for the 1974 program. A recommendation was made that the Society request papers on local demographic studies as well as papers dealing with methodology in educational research.

Professor Peters noted that 1974 would be the tenth anniversary of the Society and that the program might well reflect the special interests of the Society during its first decade. A special word of appreciation was expressed to the faculty of Loyola University who had graciously hosted the Society throughout its history. The invitation to meet at Loyola for the tenth anniversary meeting of the Society was gratefully accepted.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen A. Archibald
Secretary

MID-WEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

ATTENDANCE LIST 1973

Leo Adams	Loyola University
Patrick L. Alston	Bowling Green State University
James D. Anderson	Indiana University
Helen Archibald	Emory and Henry College
Joseph Barney	North Central Association
Robert Belding	University of Iowa
Norman R. Bernier	University of Wisconsin
William W. Brickman	University of Pennsylvania
Paula Marie Broski	Loyola University
David B. Bills	Loyola University
R. Freeman Butts	Teachers College, Columbia Univ.
John Calam	University of British Columbia
Reverend Charles J. Carmody	Loyola University
Delos L. Carroll	University of South Florida
Robert Church	Northwestern University
Geraldine J. Clifford	University of California
Ronald Cohen	Indiana University
Sheldon S. Cohen	Loyola University
Stephen M. Colby	Loyola University
Ian E. Davey	O.I.S.E.
Peter P. DeBoer	Calvin College
Edward Denys	Luther High School South-Chicago
Robert J. Donatelli	Loyola University
Rosemary Donatelli	Loyola University
Gerard F. Downes	Loyola University
Walter H. Drost	Wisconsin Lutheran College
Eric A. Duplisea	University of Maine
H. B. Dunkel	University of Chicago
Charles M. Dye	The University of Akron
Joan M. Ferris	Loyola University

Glen Gabert
Moraine Valley Community College
Harvey J. Graff
O.I.S.E.
Patricia Albjerg Graham
Barnard College, Columbia Univ.
Carl H. Gross
Michigan State University
Gerald Gutek
Loyola University
Glenn Heck
National College
David Hocran
University of Illinois
Charles Hollinger
Loyola University
Walter Husted
Bowling Green State University
Brenda Jackson
Indiana University
John, Wm. H.E.
University of Pittsburgh
Kay Kamin
Rosary College
Clarence J. Karier
University of Illinois
Joe Kirschner
Youngstown State University
George Kizer
Iowa State University
Frances Kung
Loyola University
Karen Kukura
Loyola University
W. P. Krolikowski
Loyola University
Sr. Norlene M. Kunkel
University of Notre Dame
Patricia A. Kurriger
College of Du Page
Vincent P. Lannie
University of Notre Dame
Bill Lee
Loyola University
Neil Lloyd
Loyola University
Clarita G. Miraflor
Loyola University
Russell Marks

Robert W. Matthews
Loyola University
Daria Markus
De Paul University
Robert E. Mason
Southern Illinois University
Samuel T. Mayo
Loyola University
Victoria Menchaca
Loyola University
Jonathan C. Messerli
Fordham University
Steven I. Miller
Loyola University
J. Geoffrey Moore
Michigan State University

Timothy H. Morrissey
St. Thomas
Robert McCaul
University of Chicago
Edward McClellan
Indiana University
James McDonnell
Notre Dame University
Dan McDougall
Loyola University
Asirvatham Periaswamy
Loyola University
Norman R. Phillips
Chicago City College
Adelia Peters
Bowling Green State University
Theresa Psihalos
Loyola University
Joseph N. Rathnau
Chicago State University
David B. Ripley
Northern Illinois University
Brisbane Rouzan
University of Illinois
William E. Russell
National Endowment For
The Humanities
Edward Rutkowski
University of Northern Iowa
W. M. Sack
Loyola University
Charles Edward Samec
Loyola University
Marie Salwonchik
Chicago Public Schools
Kathryn Sasso
Loyola University
S. Savarimuthu
Loyola University
Carolyn Schumacher
University of Pittsburgh
K. Smith
Loyola University
Murray S. Shereshewsky
E. Strounsburg St. College
Sam R. Snyder
University of Toledo
Charles Sprandel
Maumee Valley County Day School
Pat Stelmach
Loyola University
W. Richard Stephens
Greenville College
Charles E. Strickland
Emory College
Terrence Sullivan
Loyola University
Beatrice Beach Szekely

Jeanne M. O'Toole
Loyola University
Selwyn Troen
University of Missouri

Wayne Urban	Georgia State University
Jasper J. Valenti	Loyola University
Rena Vassar	Calif. State Univ., Northridge
Paul C. Violas	University of Illinois, Urbana
Helena Wan	Loyola University
Donald R. Warren	University of Illinois
Andrew Wawrzyniak	Loyola University
George Woytanowitz	Indiana State University
John M. Wozniak	Loyola University
Joan Wuterich	Salem State College
Reverend Robert J. Zimney	St. Vincent De Paul Seminary